Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lori Conrad to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 11:08 PM
Please respond to lcmtca

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lori Conrad
3031 Bryant Place
Davis, CA 95618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Allegra Chambers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 10:35 PM
Please respond to Hi .allegra

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Allegra Chambers
675 sycamore st
Oakland, CA 94612
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diana R. to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 06:35 PM
Please respond to dianela _2402

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diana R.
C
México, AK 57170
MX

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Damon Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 05:51 PM
Please respond to d .brown.2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Damon Brown
3536 Cloverdale Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90016
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
DM Fleming to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 04:31 PM
Please respond to dfleming

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

DM Fleming
1107 Halifax Ave
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mila Salazar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 03:12 PM
Please respond to mila

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mila Salazar
8016 Ney Ave.
Oakland, CA 94605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brad Nelson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 02:34 PM
Please respond to bwnSSurfn 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brad Nelson
333 Sunset Dr.
Oxnard, CA 93035
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Lotz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 02:18 PM
Please respond to lizlotz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Lotz
3181 Stony Point Rd
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sheilagh Creighton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 01:31 PM
Please respond to yankeesmc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheilagh Creighton
285 Scenic Road
Fairfax, CA 94930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Vance Handley to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to vhandley

11/23/2014 11:32 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vance Handley
3642 1/2 Mentone AVE
Los Angeles, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

chris ness to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ephemeristheway

11/23/2014 10:39 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

chris ness
61 tarquin cres
ottawa, ON k2h8j7
CA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ruth Lombard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 09:02 AM
Please respond to hunbard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ruth Lombard
514 Baines Ave
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeffrey Long to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 08:19 AM
Please respond to jeffrey .c.long

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Please. I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeffrey Long
712 Rosemont Ave
Ramona, CA 93950
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Aysenur Çömlekci to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 03:51 AM
Please respond to nournex

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Aysenur Çömlekci
I.Çelebi Mh.
Manisa, Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, IA 45010
CA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William Winburn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/23/2014 12:54 AM
Please respond to robinwinburn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Winburn
6568 Beachview Dr.
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nell Wade to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 10:36 PM
Please respond to nellcentralcoast 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nell Wade
2327 Lopez
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
yoshi miyamoto to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 10:35 PM
Please respond to yoshiloop

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

yoshi miyamoto
320 lee st
oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Hughes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 08:09 PM
Please respond to jimhugs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Hughes
246 Brewery Lane
Auburn, CA 95603
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Patricia Strauss to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 07:19 PM
Please respond to patnewyorkred

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Strauss
1817 N. Fuller Ave., Apt. 104
Los Angeles, CA 90046-238
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Greg Goodman to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to gregthegardener

11/22/2014 06:33 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Greg Goodman
4049 Chestnut Avenue
Concord, CA 94519
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lois Gorrell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 06:18 PM
Please respond to tinatuner 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lois Gorrell
1505 Clearview Lane
Santa Ana, CA 92705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jennifer Valentine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 05:51 PM
Please respond to Jennifercvalentine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Valentine
13480 Cheltenham Dr.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Caitriona Smyth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 04:36 PM
Please respond to caitriona _smyth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Caitriona Smyth
2527 ridge road
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
heather clough to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 04:24 PM
Please respond to lilmisshac

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

heather clough
7187 lemur st
ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Heyman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 03:50 PM
Please respond to inspirit 10

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Heyman
7418 W 88th place
Los Angeles, CA 90045
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Miss Canan T to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 02:53 PM
Please respond to canant

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miss Canan T
-
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carly Clements Owens to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 02:16 PM
Please respond to ohcarlyo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carly Clements Owens
211 South Ave
Alamo, CA 94507
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Logan Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 01:08 PM
Please respond to loggansmith 3000

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Logan Smith
2419 Locust Street
Santa Maria, CA 93458
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Edinger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 01:04 PM
Please respond to edingerea

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains, and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes, and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review, Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil, making this project incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Edinger
10822 Magnolia Blvd., Apt. 36
North Hollywood, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rodolfo Scarpati to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 10:22 AM
Please respond to rscarpati 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rodolfo Scarpati
3056 Castro Valley Blvd. #24
Castro Valley, CA 94546
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
krisetn fera to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 10:08 AM
Please respond to bunnichica 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

krisetn fera
320
cleveland, OH 44111
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bob Mannix to: p66-railspur-comments 11/22/2014 06:22 AM
Please respond to montereyvistas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bob Mannix
3320 B Del Monte Blvd.
Marina, CA 93933
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robin Ryan to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to abacusaurus

11/22/2014 05:29 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. The area already suffers from the environmental impact of unchecked fuel generation, and this would exacerbate the situation greatly.

Robin Ryan
966 Chenery St
San Francisco, CA 94131
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mika Stonehawk to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 10:58 PM
Please respond to mikachu 51

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mika Stonehawk
2480 Irvine Blvd
Tustin, CA 92782
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mark Jordan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 10:48 PM
Please respond to moon .j

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Jordan
2340 Harper Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah Aird to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sarah _aird

11/21/2014 08:28 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Aird
575 O'Farrell Street #99
San Francisco, CA 94102
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sandra Traum to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 08:25 PM
Please respond to STraum 01

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Traum
6 Mancera
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sigrid Asmus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 07:27 PM
Please respond to essay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing from the Blast Zone in urban Seattle to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine your state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put all our West Coast communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sigrid Asmus
4009 24 Ave W
Seattle, WA 98199
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susanna Battin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 06:51 PM
Please respond to Sbattin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susanna Battin
24700 McBean Parkway
Valencia, CA 91355
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauri Riley Dowling to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 06:29 PM
Please respond to starlightwithin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauri Riley Dowling
13846 Kittridge St.
Valley Glen, CA 91405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
brian Lewis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 06:12 PM
Please respond to bz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

brian Lewis
6802 gunn dr
oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
donna wood to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to donnainthewoods
11/21/2014 05:54 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

donna wood
po box1335
haiku, HI 96708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alan Schenck to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to aschenck 771

11/21/2014 05:23 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alan Schenck
1784 Kimberly Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Buff Whitman-Bradley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 05:02 PM
Please respond to buff .wb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Buff Whitman-Bradley
142 Dominga Ave.
Fairfax, CA 94930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Henry DeNicola to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 04:57 PM
Please respond to denicol 99

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Henry DeNicola
3822 Bloomfield Rd
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Antonella Marinelli to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 04:53 PM
Please respond to antomari .thebest

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Antonella Marinelli
Via Dei Mille, 16
Sammichele di Bari, ot 70010
IT

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eric Wolfe to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ewwolfe

11/21/2014 04:46 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eric Wolfe
1291 29th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Camille Herrera to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 04:43 PM
Please respond to camilleherrera

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Camille Herrera
4301 Abbington Court
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Asano Fertig to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 04:19 PM
Please respond to asanof

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Asano Fertig
11 Virginia Gardens
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Domenico Graniello to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 04:00 PM
Please respond to graniello .studiotempone

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Domenico Graniello
Via Degli Alberi, 26/B
Casamassima, ot 70010
IT

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kristie Choi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 02:54 PM
Please respond to thephatchoi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristie Choi
26592 Meadow Crest Drive
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Victoria De Goff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 02:11 PM
Please respond to vjdrs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Victoria De Goff
1916 Los Angeles Ave
Berkeley, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert De Goff and family to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 02:11 PM
Please respond to rdegoff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert De Goff and family
638 San Luis Road
Berkeley, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Richard Sherman to : p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 02:11 PM

Please respond to vjdrsg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Sherman
1916 Los Angeles Ave
Berkeley, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William De Goff to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to billdegoff
11/21/2014 02:10 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William De Goff
109 Walnut Street
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ludo Stassijns to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 01:15 PM
Please respond to ludo .stassijns

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ludo Stassijns
Mandekensstraat 6
Lebbeke, ot 9280
BE

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ann Maijala to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 12:53 PM
Please respond to amaijala

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Maijala
1748 S. Mountain Ave. #D
Ontario, CA 91762
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sandra bell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 11:59 AM
Please respond to sandysprite

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. Industry has no right to spoil our environment for profit.

sandra bell
5519 sylvia ave
tarzana, CA 91356
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Ann Gamma to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to mimigamma

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Ann Gamma
740 E. Thomson Ave.
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Llauren Peralta to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 11:14 AM
Please respond to bodhineverdisparag

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Llauren Peralta
322 Nevq pl.
Los Angeles, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
lisa hoivik to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 10:53 AM
Please respond to lhoivik

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lisa hoivik
linda vista pl
monterey, CA 93940
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
mel marcus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 10:06 AM
Please respond to earthmamamel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

mel marcus
5718 e scrivener st
long beach, CA 90808
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M L to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 09:02 AM
Please respond to mlightyear 2011

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M L
river st.
kent, OH 44240
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Christopher Pond to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 03:06 AM
Please respond to CPondx

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Pond
22129 N Umpqua Hwy
Glide, OR 97443
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jessica Blaylock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 02:44 AM
Please respond to jpsalvador 91

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jessica Blaylock
1806 Grant Ave
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stefanie Yellis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 01:06 AM
Please respond to stef .yellis

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stefanie Yellis
4211 Harbor View Ave.
Oakland, CA 94619
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael & Diane McGrath to: p66-railspur-comments 11/21/2014 12:38 AM
Please respond to michaelmcgrath

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael & Diane McGrath
12101 Bradford Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathryn Cissna to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to rkcissna

11/20/2014 10:03 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathryn Cissna
18616 65th Ct NE
Kenmore, WA 98028
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wave Baker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 09:34 PM
Please respond to wave

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wave Baker
990 Meadowlark Lane
Laguna Beach, CA 92651
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vicki Cyr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:53 PM
Please respond to vcyr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vicki Cyr
128 Ash Grove Court
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ruby McCracken to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:32 PM
Please respond to charlieram

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ruby McCracken
31250 John Wallace Rd
Evergreen, CO 80249
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jeanie ruggles to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:24 PM
Please respond to jearuggles

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jeanie ruggles
2146 N Euclid
Upland, CA 91784
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Laurance shinderman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:14 PM
Please respond to lshinderman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurance shinderman
1878 Eucalyptus Rd
Nipomo, CA 93444
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kirsten Meeker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:13 PM
Please respond to kmeeker

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kirsten Meeker
442 Anacapa St.
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Johanne Zell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 07:57 PM
Please respond to jemzell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Johanne Zell
2884 Redondo Ave.
Camarillo, CA 93012
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Adam McMullen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 07:16 PM
Please respond to adammcm 39

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Adam McMullen
744 Roseheath Drive
Milton, ON L9T 4R4
CA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
George Vye to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 06:51 PM
Please respond to gmvye

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

George Vye
10388 Boulder Court
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Birgit Hermann to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to Bhermannsf

11/20/2014 06:50 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Birgit Hermann
627 Page Street #7
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Suzanne deason to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 06:14 PM
Please respond to yogalife

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Suzanne deason
2045 Silverado St
San Marcos, CA 92078
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Suzanne deason to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 06:14 PM
Please respond to yogalife

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Suzanne deason
2045 Silverado St
San Marcos, CA 92078
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pam Lynn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 06:12 PM
Please respond to pambolynn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pam Lynn
9 Longwood Lake Road
Oak Ridge, NJ 07438
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shinobu Fukushima to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 05:58 PM
Please respond to lust 4lifex

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shinobu Fukushima
4 Yoyogi Shibuya
Tokyo, ot 1510053
JP

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
mike fitzpatrick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 05:27 PM
Please respond to mikelfitz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

mike fitzpatrick
13928 village ave.
healdsburg, CA 95448
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maggie O'Driscoll to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 04:23 PM
Please respond to drewsmaggie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maggie O'Driscoll
142 S Ave. 56
Los Angeles, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Olga Alvarado to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 03:53 PM
Please respond to mygeneralmail

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Olga Alvarado
Santa Rosa Street
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

DH Higgins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 03:25 PM
Please respond to dena .h.higgins

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

DH Higgins
Bolinas Road
Fairfax, CA 94930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Hammermeister to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 02:30 PM
Please respond to necrohead 56

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Hammermeister
16456 Shamhart Dr.
granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patricia Flaherty to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 02:07 PM
Please respond to pattyf 81782

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Flaherty
11100 Telegraph Rd. #111
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
rosemary nelson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 02:00 PM
Please respond to rosemarynelson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

rosemary nelson
1928 Eucalyptus Road
nipomo, CA 93444
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Monica Brunetto to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 01:28 PM
Please respond to mmbrunetto 132

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Monica Brunetto
2321 Somerset AVe
Castro Valley, CA 94546
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
william diantonio to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to flydutchmotel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

william diantonio
19 kristen
mantua, NJ 08051
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
W. Gish to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 01:00 PM
Please respond to seapink 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

W. Gish
PO Box 01
GLENDALE, CA 91201
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
karen black to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to buffalogirls 2004

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

karen black
1028 florida street
vallejo, CA 94590
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
karen black to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to buffalogirls 2004

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

karen black
1028 florida street
vallejo, CA 94590
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Thomas Patterson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to t .c.patterson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thomas Patterson
318 Leland Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sandy carter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:42 PM
Please respond to sandycat 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sandy carter
1027 nw charlemagne pl
corvallis, OR 97330
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marilyn Logan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to katlogan 438

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marilyn Logan
22816 Market St
Newhall, CA 91321
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Miguel Poblete to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:04 PM
Please respond to gydudmn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miguel Poblete
6714 Sabado Tarde Rd.
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Benzel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 11:58 AM
Please respond to Karenbenzelpr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Benzel
PO Box 5334, Carpenter 2 SW of 2nd
Carmel,, CA 93921
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Aurelie Ward to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 11:27 AM
Please respond to health

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Aurelie Ward
1409 Forest Park Drvie
Statesville, NC 28677
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lori Biagini to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 11:08 AM
Please respond to Biagvela

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lori Biagini
1392 everest td
Venice, FL 34293
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jennifer Eggertsen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 10:51 AM
Please respond to jennifer .eggertsen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Eggertsen
438 Day Road
Ventura, CA 93003

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
corey benjamin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 10:44 AM
Please respond to scoob 8178

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

corey benjamin
970 menlo ave
los angeles, CA 90006
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joyce Campbell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 10:41 AM
Please respond to jcampb 8116

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joyce Campbell
3336 Winlock Road
Torrance, CA 90505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Essman to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to johnessman
11/20/2014 10:38 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Essman
P. O. Box 1381
Healdsburg, CA 95448
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carolyn Simone to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 10:11 AM
Please respond to css 3328803

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carolyn Simone
541 N. Sparks St.
Burbank, CA 91506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
loree clary to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 09:06 AM
Please respond to loreeclary

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

loree clary
14561-A North Butte Rd
Live Oak, CA 95953
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carrie Bennett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 08:08 AM
Please respond to megatherium

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carrie Bennett
1601 Belvedere Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rhea Damon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 07:19 AM
Please respond to damonrhead

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rhea Damon
4263 Las Virgenes Rd Unit 7
Calabasas, CA 91302
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Scott to: p66-railspur-comments 11/20/2014 12:00 AM
Please respond to dscott 422

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Scott
423 E. Rosewood Court
Ontario, CA 91764
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Timothy Lippert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 11:26 PM
Please respond to zegonite

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Timothy Lippert
210 Donegal Way
Martinez, CA 94553
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Andrew Cantino to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 11:06 PM
Please respond to cantino

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrew Cantino
247 Grattan St
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
N. J. Clerici & family to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 10:45 PM
Please respond to coleclerici

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

N. J. Clerici & family
1514 Flora St
Crockett, CA 94525
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Larry Serna to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to serna 777

11/19/2014 10:06 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Larry Serna
2496 S Westgate Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90064
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
morty gr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:54 PM
Please respond to mortygr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

morty gr
2169a aroma drive
west covina, CA 91791
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Lentz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:00 PM
Please respond to salentz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Lentz
7927 Robbie Cir.
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janice Gloe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 08:48 PM
Please respond to rainglo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janice Gloe
3100 Guido St
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Matthew Leddy to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mtleddy

11/19/2014 08:31 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

OUR SON LIVES NEAR THE RAILROAD TRACKS IN OAKLAND AND WE ARE VERY WORRIED ABOUT HIS SAFETY!!!

PLEASE deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in affected towns just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project

simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thank you!

Matthew Leddy
275 D Street
Redwood City, CA 94063

Matthew Leddy
275 D Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jean Lawson Saint Hill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 08:09 PM
Please respond to Jmlawsonsthill

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jean Lawson Saint Hill
1528 N Caswell Ave
Pomona, CA 91767
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Bradley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 07:25 PM
Please respond to jandbbradley

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Bradley
9458 Bosworth Court
Newark, CA 94560
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bronte Kass to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 07:19 PM
Please respond to 14bkass

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bronte Kass
16383 Aztec Ridge Dr
Los Gatos, CA 95030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dalana Duncan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 06:11 PM
Please respond to dalanaduncan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dalana Duncan
1775 W. Mosier Pl.
Denver, CO 80223
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joel Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 06:06 PM
Please respond to greenplanter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joel Johnson
309 Cedar St. #31
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Shari Eubanks to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:54 PM
Please respond to sharieubanks

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shari Eubanks
5013 Westpark drive
N. Hollywood, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sandra Walker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:39 PM
Please respond to blue -dolphin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Walker
seacountry
RSM, CA 92688
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Wayne Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:08 PM

Please respond to wmcats

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

As a chemist and a scientist that understands the toxicity of tarsands oil and its explosive properties, I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wayne Miller
36505 Bridgepointe Drive
Newark, CA 94560
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rose Miksovsky to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:08 PM
Please respond to Rosem 65

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rose Miksovsky
5343 broadway terr
Oakland, CA 94618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Monica Hernandez Osmond to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:06 PM
Please respond to hernandez .osmond

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Monica Hernandez Osmond
1061 Sierra Avenue
MARTINEZ, CA 94553
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patricia Quimby to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 04:41 PM
Please respond to pquimby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Quimby
5175 W. 21st Street
Los Angeles, CA 90016
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Paul and Kathleen Lanctot to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 04:22 PM
Please respond to lanctot

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

We are writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

We are strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.
we insist the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paul and Kathleen Lanctot
Lockewood Lane
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ally Gialketsis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 04:04 PM
Please respond to agialketsis

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ally Gialketsis
380 Teloma Dr
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Merrill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:56 PM
Please respond to jim .merrill

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Merrill
4411 Beaumont Avenue
Oxnard, CA 93033
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joyce Gubelman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:39 PM
Please respond to jgubelman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joyce Gubelman
5600 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauren Linda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:29 PM
Please respond to laulind 714

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Linda
2376C Via Mariposa West
Laguna Woods, CA 92637
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carla Cicchi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:07 PM
Please respond to cjc 2sea

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly implore you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery.

Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public.
--The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014.
--This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined.
--The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. --This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons.
--Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery.
--The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast.
--A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo.
--Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project.
--At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making

this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carla Cicchi
POB 907
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Mason to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:05 PM
Please respond to DMason 6942

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Mason
1493 Westmont Ave.
Campbell, CA 95008
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Twomey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:49 PM
Please respond to ptwomey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Twomey
38 Montell St
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nicole Maschke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:33 PM
Please respond to mauricemaschke

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nicole Maschke
4802 Gedeon Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44102
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cecilia Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:25 PM
Please respond to cecilia .brown

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cecilia Brown
Chelton Dr
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rita Franco to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:05 PM
Please respond to mondofranc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rita Franco
10538 Whitegate Ave
Sunland, CA 91040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robert Barnett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:01 PM
Please respond to robertj .barnett

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

In addition to the comments below, I must advise that Ventura residents will not allow dangerous trains to use our rails. Please make a responsible decision on this matter. Thank you for your continued service to California communities.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every

stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Barnett
4432 Whittier Ave
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Travis Lyons to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:34 PM
Please respond to travsition

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Travis Lyons
K
Sonoma, CA 95476

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Orva M Gullett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:22 PM
Please respond to mistie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Orva M Gullett
1922 Victory Rd Lot #116
Marion, OH 43302
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robbi Curtis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:14 PM
Please respond to robbicurtis

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robbi Curtis
8080 Horseshoe bar Rd
Loomis, CA 95650
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Denis Petitt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:11 PM
Please respond to denis .petitt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Denis Petitt
1046 North Screenland Drive
Burbank, CA 91505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debbie Neimark to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:03 PM
Please respond to neimark

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debbie Neimark
6018 n. oakley ave
Chicago, IL 60659
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
lisa hoivik to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to lhoivik

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lisa hoivik
linda vista pl
monterey, CA 93940
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ian and Janeane Moody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:01 PM
Please respond to jandimoody

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ian and Janeane Moody
6 Alexander Ave.
Sausalito, CA 94965
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ian and Janeane Moody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:01 PM
Please respond to jandimoody

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ian and Janeane Moody
6 Alexander Ave.
Sausalito, CA 94965
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dori Littell -Herrick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 11:40 AM
Please respond to dori .woodbury

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am a Ventura resident who lives less than a mile from the main north-south rail corridor. I am concerned that officials in San Luis Obispo County have the power to approve oil-by-rail that runs through our neighborhoods. I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project

simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dori Littell-Herrick
1681 Santa Ynez St.
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Arlene Geraci -Benson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 11:15 AM
Please respond to Sweepitup

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arlene Geraci-Benson
525. Auzerais Ave
San Jose, CA 95126
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elisabeth Bollman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 11:01 AM
Please respond to elisabethbollman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elisabeth Bollman
9464 Wellington Cir.
Windsor, CA 95492
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Bryan Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 10:42 AM
Please respond to bryanbrown 76

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bryan Brown
6516 Lexington Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90038
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Robbin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 10:40 AM
Please respond to blrsc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Robbin
11201 Dona Lola Drive
Studio City, CA 91604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Teri Hitt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 10:39 AM
Please respond to info

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Teri Hitt
4071 Duquesne Ave.
Culver City, CA 90232
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeanne Benioff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 10:24 AM
Please respond to jbenioff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeanne Benioff
765 Upland Road
Redwood City, CA 94062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Lay to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:57 AM
Please respond to davidlay 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Lay
2630 Tuller Ave
El Cerrito, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Leka to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:55 AM
Please respond to Patrick .leka

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Leka
1056 N Olive St
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
rosemary jewkes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:53 AM
Please respond to rosebudj

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

rosemary jewkes
via estrada
laguna woods, CA 92637
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
virginia mendez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:46 AM
Please respond to virginialefay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

virginia mendez
NE 173 street
Miami, FL 33160
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lynn Weeks to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:41 AM
Please respond to theluvdoctor

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynn Weeks
7231 Kodiak St
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Julie Brickell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:40 AM
Please respond to juliebrickell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julie Brickell
210 W Union Ave Apt 13
Fullerton, CA 92832
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Margaret Morris to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:25 AM
Please respond to mrgrtmorris

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margaret Morris
2866 Apache Ave.
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Deb Ebling to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:25 AM
Please respond to debbie .ebling4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Deb Ebling
1518 NOrth Street
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marya Mayer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:18 AM
Please respond to maryasemail

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marya Mayer
5892 Eagles Nest DR
Jupiter, FL 33458
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dan Martin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 09:04 AM
Please respond to MartinHeitman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dan Martin
339 Marlow Dr.
Oakland, CA 94605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
E Gomez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 08:38 AM
Please respond to Gypsysoul 83

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

E Gomez
216 f street box 19
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mark Mendelsohn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 08:05 AM
Please respond to mmendels 33

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Mendelsohn
8076 Crystal Pl
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Heather Blancho to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 08:01 AM
Please respond to hrblancho

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Blancho
107 Gerard Drive
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diane McLaughlin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 07:30 AM
Please respond to mclaughlin _sharani

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diane McLaughlin
13202 Summertime Ln
Culver City, CA 90230
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brittny Roeland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 06:50 AM
Please respond to Britann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brittny Roeland
2039 35th ave
San Francisco, CA 94116
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Leslie Labrin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 06:16 AM
Please respond to kelly _labrin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leslie Labrin
756 harps st
san fernando, CA 91340
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Judy Moran to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 06:15 AM
Please respond to timstarjudy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Judy Moran
6109 N. Star Dr.
Panama City, FL 32404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alexander Gutierrez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 05:32 AM
Please respond to darkartsfart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alexander Gutierrez
6109 Hutton Ct
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Yu-Chien Huang to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 04:52 AM
Please respond to siyuchien

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Yu-Chien Huang
POBox 400120
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Yu-Chien Huang to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 04:52 AM
Please respond to siyuchien

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Yu-Chien Huang
POBox 400120
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Mulcare to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:58 AM

Please respond to xsecretsx

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Mulcare
1110 Benjamin St
Clarkston, WA 99403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David LaBrue to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to labrue
11/19/2014 03:45 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David LaBrue
711 High St
Marysville, CA 95901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mark Mulder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 03:30 AM
Please respond to mistermark 77

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Mulder
1200 Settle Ave
San Jose, CA 95125
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Timothy Kilbreath to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:20 AM
Please respond to tk 950

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Timothy Kilbreath
20333 Hebard Rd
Los Gatos, CA 95033
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
chaz berlusconi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 02:17 AM
Please respond to chazberlusconi 406

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

chaz berlusconi
20 Amber Ridge
Pretoria, IL 01099
ZA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
nancy gowani to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:42 AM
Please respond to nancyg 900

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nancy gowani
P.O. BOX 2533
WINNETKA, CA 91396
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robert Ortiz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 01:17 AM
Please respond to r 77ortiz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Ortiz
25 H Lane
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sarah Stiles to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:50 AM
Please respond to fire

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Stiles
1933 Knolls Dr,
Santa Rosa, CA 95405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Simone Oliver to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:44 AM
Please respond to Simoneheals

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Simone Oliver
1436 Lorraine way
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M'chel McQueen -Martinez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:39 AM
Please respond to veganvocals

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M'chel McQueen-Martinez
12548 212th St
Lakewood, CA 90715
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:32 AM
Please respond to rljldk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Johnson
1257 E. Maple Ave.
El Segundo, CA 90245
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Klein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/19/2014 12:31 AM
Please respond to kleinjohnson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Klein
1257 E. Maple Ave.
El Segundo, CA 90245
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
R M to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:59 PM
Please respond to remey 24

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

R M
11450 Church
Rancho, CA 91730
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
maria bon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:47 PM
Please respond to pbon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

maria bon
5719 Nutwood Circle
simi valley, CA 93063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristine Melzner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:36 PM
Please respond to kamelzner

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristine Melzner
336 I St.
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lorie Ramos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:22 PM
Please respond to LorieinLA

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lorie Ramos
1920 E Olympic Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joan Pool to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mompool

11/18/2014 11:22 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Pool
2001 Eastwood dr
Vacaville, CA 95687
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kent Minault to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to getkent

11/18/2014 11:09 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kent Minault
13214 Magnolia Blvd.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kent Minault to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:56 PM
Please respond to getkent

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kent Minault
13214 Magnolia Blvd.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jo Chen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:53 PM
Please respond to Origindance

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jo Chen
5102 Via El Molino
Newbury Park, CA 91320
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rachel May to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:53 PM
Please respond to rachelmaymd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rachel May
11005 Salinas Road
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Correro to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:43 PM
Please respond to mrcorrero

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Correro
2145 Tiffany Walk
Manteca, CA 95336
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Emily Hancock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:40 PM
Please respond to emily

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emily Hancock
1230 Glen Ave
Berkeley, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barney McComas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:36 PM
Please respond to barndoggy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barney McComas
1717 Euclid Avenue, Apt 5
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vince Rubino to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:30 PM
Please respond to convinceable

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vince Rubino
555 pierce street
Albany, CA 94706
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Thomas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:00 PM
Please respond to spamhater 25

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Thomas
639 15th St
Richmond, CA 94801
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sheila Barrand to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:43 PM
Please respond to sheila .barrand

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheila Barrand
280320 Festivo
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeanne Crabb to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jeancrabb

11/18/2014 09:36 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeanne Crabb
35205 Cornish Dr
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Frances Onesti to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:22 PM
Please respond to fonesti

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frances Onesti
4564 W 171st St
Lawndale, CA 90260
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mari Down to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:21 PM
Please respond to starry .eyd.babe

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mari Down
9551 Butterfield Way
Sacramento, CA 95827
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Gardner to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to dgardner
11/18/2014 09:14 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Gardner
2525 Beverly Ave #8
Santa Monica, CA 90405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Penelope Prochazka to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:04 PM
Please respond to propen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Penelope Prochazka
3432 Corpus Christi
SImi Valley, CA 93063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Julie Alley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:01 PM
Please respond to Juliesbooks

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julie Alley
3553 Atlantic Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90807
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pam Griffin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:58 PM
Please respond to griffin .pamela.s

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pam Griffin
41029 Village 41
Camarillo, CA 93012
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
KAY M to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:57 PM
Please respond to nannik

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

KAY M
METRY
METAIRIE, LA 70005
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steve Giddings to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:53 PM
Please respond to alpinist

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Giddings
121 Calle Alamo
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Thom Decant to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:51 PM
Please respond to T .decant

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thom Decant
59 Lupine
SF, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Vanden Bos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:51 PM
Please respond to sv 2230

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Vanden Bos
6272 Priscilla Drive
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
dennis hadenfeldt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:38 PM
Please respond to dendalfthegreen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

dennis hadenfeldt
1229 Pomeroy Road
arroyo grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Margo Praus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:30 PM
Please respond to margopraus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margo Praus
1947 W. Harding Way
Stockton, CA 95203
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan Kenney Henry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:28 PM
Please respond to susan .henry3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Kenney Henry
12304 Gilmore
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chris Bailey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:16 PM
Please respond to chris _bailey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chris Bailey
11400 cuervo way
atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bruce Wismer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:10 PM
Please respond to bwismer 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Wismer
60 Scenic Ave
Richmond, CA 94801
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Suzanne Gilmore to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to suzannegil

11/18/2014 08:08 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Suzanne Gilmore
87 Lakeshore Ct
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Tao to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:56 PM
Please respond to caroltao 22

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Tao
241 Geil St Apt A
Salinas, CA 93901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Charles Neal to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to cneal 560

11/18/2014 07:46 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Charles Neal
2625 Franklin St. #304
San Francisco, CA 94123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
karen wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:43 PM
Please respond to karenwilson 19

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

karen wilson
3505 sonoma bl #320
vallejo, CA 94590
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rick Morales to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:39 PM
Please respond to Morales 1000

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rick Morales
11843 courtleigh dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anna Thurman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:36 PM
Please respond to akthurman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anna Thurman
870 Anson Street
Simi Valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ellyn Sutton to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ellynsutton

11/18/2014 07:34 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ellyn Sutton
P.O. Box 940884
Simi Valley, CA 93094
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
C. Fazio to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:33 PM
Please respond to cfazio 10

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

C. Fazio
PO Box 7826
Cotati, CA 94931
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Anna Mosqueda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:27 PM
Please respond to anna .mosqueda

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anna Mosqueda
9370 Oak Avenue
Orangevale, CA 95662
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Rotcher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:26 PM
Please respond to michaelrotcher

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Rotcher
24542 Tarazona
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

E. Lehuanani Phillips to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:23 PM
Please respond to leialoha 333

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

E. Lehuanani Phillips
23502 Magic Mtn Pkwy #1505
Valencia, CA 91355
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joseph Holmes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:18 PM
Please respond to jh

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

The unprecedented combination of extremely explosive, light crude, and gigantic rail shipments has launched a new era of horrific man-made catastrophes, in which entire sections of ordinary American communities are obliterated by rail "accidents". Most of this hasn't happened yet, of course, but it's coming fast.

We must say no to this insane plot to end the future. We are forty years past the point where we needed to abandon fossil fuels as rapidly as possible. Now, every coastal community in the world, every river delta in the world, every coral reef -- they all face unavoidable, catastrophic flooding.

It's an absolute certainly already that at least one meter of sea level rise will occur as a result of one ice sheet alone, but more likely that five or six meters of sea level rise has already been locked in.

If you understand the physical geography of the world, you'll know that five or six meters of sea level rise amounts to armageddon. Hundreds of trillions of dollars in damages, many dozens of times the cost of switching to an all-renewable/carbon-free energy system.

It's over. Say no to fossil fuels at every opportunity. Even if <your> town won't be hurt much by 16 feet of sea level rise. If you've never been in a delta, you need to go see one. Flat as a pancake for mile after mile after mile. Precisely at sea level over a huge area.

Not to mention the agriculture-destroying effects or the wildlife obliteration or the continued lung and heart disease or the end of most life in the sea from acidification or the continued political corruption around the world.

Please, reject these fiendish trains. You don't want to have to say, after the first disaster, that you just didn't understand how bad it would be.

Sincerely,

Joseph Holmes
14 Highland Blvd.
Kensington, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauren Ranz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:57 PM
Please respond to lrranz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Ranz
224 Happy Hollow Ct.
Lafayette, CA 94549
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Katherine Black to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:56 PM
Please respond to hdkat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Black
P.O. Box 253
Benicia, CA 94510
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joan Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:51 PM
Please respond to jem 99876

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Miller
9 Whitecliff
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
denise lenardson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:48 PM
Please respond to tupper .ladie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

denise lenardson
8772 1/2 Wyngate St
Sunland, CA 91040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nikita Metelica to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:30 PM
Please respond to nikita .metelica

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nikita Metelica
1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Consbruck to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:25 PM
Please respond to bconsbruck

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Consbruck
12252 Willowbend Ln
Sylmar, CA 91342
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tara Holmes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:21 PM
Please respond to tmhol 37

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tara Holmes
1505 Masonic Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94117

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Bartlett -Ré to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:58 PM

Please respond to revsbr 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Bartlett-Ré
1474 Sacramento #203
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marie Brennan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:52 PM
Please respond to marie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marie Brennan
2432 10th Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Clayton Graham to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:51 PM
Please respond to clayton .t.graham

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Clayton Graham
2131 Wankel Way Apt. 340
Oxnard, CA 93036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eileen Tonzi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:50 PM
Please respond to eileen 46

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eileen Tonzi
P.O. Box 403
Galt, CA 95632
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
wanda louisse to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:38 PM
Please respond to Fwanda

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

wanda louisse
1 locuaat
irvine, CA 92604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Helen Doherty to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to morningdoveflys

11/18/2014 05:21 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Helen Doherty
336 E Carlisle Rd
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ron Dutra to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:14 PM
Please respond to randa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ron Dutra
1127 Munich St
San Francisco, CA 94112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Boyer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:14 PM
Please respond to david .boyer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Boyer
135 Mosher Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ann Lopez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:14 PM
Please respond to AnnLopez 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Lopez
5344 Taylor Way
Felton, CA 95018
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
nora coyle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:06 PM
Please respond to lcsw 89

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nora coyle
8066 E. woodsboro Ave
anaheim, CA 92807
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cheryl Chase to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:54 PM
Please respond to chase .cheryl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cheryl Chase
322 Greenoch Way, Unit D
Stockton, CA 95210
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jon Bazinet to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jon _bazinet

11/18/2014 04:46 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jon Bazinet
15972 Via Paro
San Lorenzo, CA 94580
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M H to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:41 PM
Please respond to maryh 213

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M H
1117 East End Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15218
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Krista Mahoney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:40 PM
Please respond to kristamahoney

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Krista Mahoney
5600 Morena Way
Sacramento, CA 95820
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jacquelyn Sorby to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:25 PM
Please respond to jsorby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jacquelyn Sorby
4382 Yacht Harbor Drive
Stockton, CA 95204
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brian olea to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:13 PM
Please respond to zxxtv

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian olea
6152 Tony
woodland hills, CA 91367
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
L R to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:12 PM
Please respond to bevmex

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

L R
637 westbourne
los angeles, CA 90069
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alex Silverio to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:09 PM
Please respond to asilv 777

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alex Silverio
1507 San Tomas Ct.
San Jose, CA 95130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Tico to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:58 PM
Please respond to Wendytico

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Tico
1716 Stuart
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
michael rifkind to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:49 PM
Please respond to rdokarma

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

michael rifkind
empire grade
canta cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susannah Mills to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:47 PM
Please respond to sooz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susannah Mills
Box # 402
Bolinas, CA 94924
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Randy Fewel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:44 PM
Please respond to jailteacher

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Randy Fewel
661 Orangewood Drive
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
dillua ashby to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:16 PM
Please respond to dilluashby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

dillua ashby
4022 tracy st.
los angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cathy Ashley to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to akiko .ashley

11/18/2014 03:11 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cathy Ashley
1908 19th St.
Santa Monica, CA 90404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Iris Noren to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:59 PM
Please respond to catfancier 1986

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Iris Noren
10020 Hampton Oak Drive
Elk Grove, CA 95624
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Connie Jensen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:51 PM
Please respond to eyeluvitt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Connie Jensen
p.o. box 1291
San juan Capistrano, CA 92693
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Peterson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:45 PM
Please respond to nancy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Peterson
P O Box 66488
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pete Dibble to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:42 PM
Please respond to pkrudester

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pete Dibble
117 N Mills Rd
ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paul Edelman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:42 PM
Please respond to pauledelman 22

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paul Edelman
5065 Catalon Avenue
woodland hills, CA 91364
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Martha Lyons to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:31 PM
Please respond to vertigou 2_871

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Martha Lyons
1650 Verde Vista Drive
Monterey Park, CA 91754
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Tico to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:25 PM
Please respond to Wendytico

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Tico
1716 Stuart
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erin Howard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to snz 48

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erin Howard
655 12th St.
Oakland, CA 94607
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chloe Martin to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to csmartin 1920

11/18/2014 02:18 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chloe Martin
1041 Zamora DR
Pacifica, CA 94044
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christina Ticas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:17 PM
Please respond to seamch

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christina Ticas
20325 Sherman Way
Winnetka, CA 91306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kiyomi Chadbourne to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:13 PM
Please respond to kiyomi .chadbourne

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kiyomi Chadbourne
40407 Marcia St
Fremont, CA 94063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karen Alarcon to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to karenalarconskindle

11/18/2014 02:09 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Alarcon
2235 Cedar Ave
Long Beach, CA 90806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Keith Morris to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:56 PM
Please respond to doctorkeithmorris

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Keith Morris
1522 1/2 Rosalia Rd.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan King to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to srking

11/18/2014 01:53 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan King
4396 N Marsh Elder Ct
Concord, CA 94521
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharai Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:53 PM
Please respond to earthstoryman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharai Smith
7470 Lion Alley
Georgetown, CA 95634
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeffrey Dickemann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:47 PM
Please respond to dicke .mannjeff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeffrey Dickemann
2901 Humphrey Ave.
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Natalia AlmeidA to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:44 PM
Please respond to NAtalia

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Np
I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Natalia AlmeidA
1999 Stanley ave
Santa Clara, CA 95050
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karen Moody to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to karen

11/18/2014 01:43 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Moody
945 Foxchase Dr #420
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robin Tatman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:39 PM
Please respond to robntat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robin Tatman
6267 Pebble Beach Drive
vallejo, CA 94591
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
nora Burns to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:39 PM
Please respond to nlburns 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nora Burns
1806 walnut street #10
berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ann Fischer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:35 PM
Please respond to nancy .fischer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Fischer
1579 Michael Lane
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

S Lambert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:34 PM
Please respond to lambert .studio

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

S Lambert
17300 Debbie Rd
Los Gatos, CA 95033
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marian Cruz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:28 PM
Please respond to marian .cruz2903

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marian Cruz
905 Helen Dr
Hollister, CA 95023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Peter Terpstra to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to peterterpstra

11/18/2014 01:27 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Peter Terpstra
S Orcas Street
Seattle, WA 98118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cynyhia Bristow to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:26 PM
Please respond to cyndb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cynyhia Bristow
1960 Los Alamitos Dr.
Placentia, CA 92870
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Denise Dynan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to dublin 360

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Denise Dynan
PO Box 93
Bodega Bay, CA 94923
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mrs James Denison to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to LAnnD 4animals

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mrs James Denison
6931 E. 11th St.
Long Beach, CA 90815
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Denise Lytle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to centauress 6

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Denise Lytle
73 Poplar St.
Fords, NJ 08863
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Julianna Robinson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:09 PM
Please respond to julesgracie 007

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julianna Robinson
3242 S Beverly Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rick Kemenesi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:07 PM
Please respond to fluteplayer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rick Kemenesi
1524 E. Rio Verde Dr.
West Covina, CA 91791
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
deborah nudelman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:06 PM
Please respond to Debs .nutmeg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

deborah nudelman
946 Norvell Street
el Cerrito, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Carson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:58 PM
Please respond to carson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Carson
707 Pelton Ave. Apt 208
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
wayne Sheridan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:54 PM
Please respond to wayne

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

wayne Sheridan
169 Custer Ave
San Francisco, CA 94124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Emily Snyder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:52 PM
Please respond to esnyder 200

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emily Snyder
1057 Cedar Court
Crockett, CA 94525
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Kabacinski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:47 PM
Please respond to changwen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Kabacinski
184 Quannacut Rd
Pine Bush, NY 12566
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alan Cunningham to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to alcunn

11/18/2014 12:40 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alan Cunningham
8 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, CA 93924
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Broadwater to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:36 PM
Please respond to csi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Broadwater
6604 Portola Road
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Lofgreen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:23 PM
Please respond to design

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Lofgreen
1735 Madera Street
Berkeley, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
susie simon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:22 PM
Please respond to ssimon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

susie simon
387 Mira Mar Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ernie Walters to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:19 PM
Please respond to ernwalt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ernie Walters
2437 Tartarian Way
Union City, CA 94587
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Enevoldsen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to david .enevoldsen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Enevoldsen
2970 Kentridge Drive
San Jose, CA 95133
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ernie Walters to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to ernwalt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ernie Walters
2437 Tartarian Way
Union City, CA 94587
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mark Yackley to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to meyackley

11/18/2014 11:53 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Yackley
1930 N. Hoover St.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
angela schwartz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to vamp 2964

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

angela schwartz
6442 auburn blvd #4
citrus heights, CA 95621
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Martin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to sharonmartin 5

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Martin
504 Perry Ave
Pacifica, CA 94044
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eileen Petersen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:40 AM
Please respond to eileenpetersen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eileen Petersen
3712 Radburn Drive
So. San Francisco, CA 94080
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Thomas Fitzgerald to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:34 AM
Please respond to tommac 20

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thomas Fitzgerald
1801 camden
LA, CA 90025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cheryl Albert to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to cherylalbert

11/18/2014 11:34 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cheryl Albert
56 Buena Vista Dr.
Freedom, CA 95019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lesley Stansfield to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to Lesleyastansfield

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lesley Stansfield
681, 27th street
San Francisco, CA 94131
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Margaret Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to skylark 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change; in addition and to begin with, these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way!

I am absolutely opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains, and current safety standards will not protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting entirely crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014! This is very troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined!! It is imperative that the EIR look at recent data which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error since most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars carrying millions of gallons!Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies!

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaking and increasing risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought!!

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands! Honestly!!

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the impact on our climate of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader. We cannot allow it!

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to immediately and soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thank you so much.

Margaret Adams
10250 Camarillo Street
Toluca Lake, CA 91602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Terre Dunivant to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:16 AM
Please respond to gaia

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Terre Dunivant
2647 Lawton Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Comfort to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to davidcomfort
11/18/2014 11:14 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Comfort
1460 Town and Country Dr.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
GILBERTO MELLO to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:11 AM
Please respond to versla 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

GILBERTO MELLO
6851 SUNNY CV
LOS ANGELES, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Josh Bodine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:01 AM
Please respond to joshbodine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Josh Bodine
794 Barcelona Drive
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Josh Bodine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:01 AM
Please respond to joshbodine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Josh Bodine
794 Barcelona Drive
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jennifer Kim to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 11:01 AM
Please respond to jennsfah

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Kim
1549 Conejo Ln
Fullerton, CA 92833
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sheila Dillon to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to policaudillon

11/18/2014 11:00 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheila Dillon
1701 5th St SW
Willmar, MN 56201
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Douglas Routh to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:54 AM
Please respond to drouth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Douglas Routh
1365 N. Wetherly Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90069
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wm Stefan Dwornik to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:53 AM
Please respond to steffy 21065

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wm Stefan Dwornik
820 westbourne dr#4
L.A., CA 90069
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jacqueline Sjoberg to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jacquelinesjoberg

11/18/2014 10:51 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jacqueline Sjoberg
2880 Pullman Avenue
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

tina smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:49 AM
Please respond to tina .l.smith

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

tina smith
346 sunpark lane
san jose, CA 95136
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
michael sarabia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:47 AM
Please respond to shakydog 808

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

michael sarabia
407 west longview
stockton, CA 95207
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cheryl Bullock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:44 AM
Please respond to Cheryl .bullock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cheryl Bullock
3536 Via Lato
Lompoc, CA 93436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lara Santos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:42 AM
Please respond to larasantos

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lara Santos
10549 Gothic Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jasmine Lyons to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:39 AM
Please respond to coruja 6

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jasmine Lyons
1677 Miami Ct
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Billy Trice Jr . to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:34 AM
Please respond to billytrice 5434

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Billy Trice Jr.
1611 74th Ave.
Oakland, CA 94621
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Thea DOTY to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:32 AM
Please respond to stdoty

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thea DOTY
5200 Douglas Lane
SEBASTOPOL, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
michael michel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:24 AM
Please respond to jackmcghee 007

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

michael michel
6235 kester ave #228
van nuys, CA 91411
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Janie Lucas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:24 AM
Please respond to janielucas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janie Lucas
827 Capp St
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
dennis allen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 10:08 AM
Please respond to dallen 4191

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

dennis allen
1427 Tunnel Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marsha Seeley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:58 AM
Please respond to frannysf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marsha Seeley
65 cleary court
san francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Emily Delatorre to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:58 AM
Please respond to dbeatpoohbear

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emily Delatorre
23122 samuel street
Torrance, CA 90505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K. Jenkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:57 AM
Please respond to rootrville

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K. Jenkins
8431 Tern circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92646
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Isabelle Du Soleil to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:47 AM
Please respond to isabelledusoleil

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Isabelle Du Soleil
2001 Venice
Venice, CA 90291
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cat Herr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:46 AM
Please respond to mayanmx

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cat Herr
P.O. Box 460542
San Francisco, CA 94146
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Richard Devletian to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:41 AM
Please respond to dacaterpilla

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Devletian
1646 McCollum St.
Los Angeles, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ball George to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:36 AM
Please respond to delilahandjr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ball George
4818 W. 9th St.
Inglewood, CA 90301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephen Pucci to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:34 AM
Please respond to spucci 77

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Pucci
2610 beach head way
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jennifer Custard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:33 AM
Please respond to Nsyncitnd 1787

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Custard
1011 shadow creek dr
Stockton, CA 95209
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
RICK VAGNINI to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:33 AM
Please respond to NUPCEE

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

RICK VAGNINI
5650 VALENTINA AVE.
ATASCADERO, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nicole Dotson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:32 AM
Please respond to Nldotson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Please do your part to help move the region in a positive direction forward towards the use of renewables with an emphasis on conservation, instead of a backwards investment in non-renewables which harm your constituents.

Nicole Dotson
5048 Hemlock st
Sacramento, CA 05841
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
RICK VAGNINI to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:32 AM
Please respond to NUPCEE

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

RICK VAGNINI
5650 VALENTINA AVE.
ATASCADERO, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Eric Wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:31 AM
Please respond to ericw 790

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eric Wilson
87 Vernon St., #1
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Griggs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:30 AM
Please respond to david .griggs6

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Griggs
956 maple Ave
Carpinteria, CA 93013
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Yvonne Fisher Neal to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:28 AM
Please respond to daisy 2929

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Yvonne Fisher Neal
8707 Falmouth Avenue Unit 118
Playa del Rey, CA 90293
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Decker to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to deckermw

11/18/2014 09:20 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Decker
5346 Loma Linda Ave Apt 303
Los Angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ingrid Alpha to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:17 AM
Please respond to Alpha 95.underground

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ingrid Alpha
3274e us hwy 136
Crawfordsville, IN 47933

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Merle Fishman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:16 AM
Please respond to merlefm

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Merle Fishman
3958 Tivoli Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nicole Weber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:14 AM
Please respond to nicolew 4770

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nicole Weber
356 Nature Walk
Pasadena, MD 21122
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Oman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:08 AM
Please respond to barbaraoman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Oman
po box 222357
Carmel, CA 93922
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
JAY WEINER to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:08 AM
Please respond to jaymw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

JAY WEINER
2470 CLARE STREET
SAN PABLO, CA 94806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kim Nero to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to kimonic

11/18/2014 09:07 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kim Nero
1927 harbor blvd
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anne Bush to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:06 AM
Please respond to annebush

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anne Bush
811 Channing Way
Berkeley, CA 94710
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anne Bush to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:06 AM
Please respond to annebush

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anne Bush
811 Channing Way
Berkeley, CA 94710
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rae Ann Gustafson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 09:02 AM
Please respond to raeanng

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rae Ann Gustafson
303 Laverne Ave
Mill Valley, CA 94941
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan Larson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to slarson

11/18/2014 09:00 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Larson
938 Running Stag Way
Paso Robles, CA 93446
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Megan Hobza to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:55 AM
Please respond to meganhobza

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Megan Hobza
5810 Friends Avenue
Whittier, CA 90601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joshua Van Deventer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:54 AM
Please respond to italiandutchman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joshua Van Deventer
2919 martin luther king jr way
berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lani Arellanes -Hansen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:53 AM
Please respond to Lanishots

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lani Arellanes-Hansen
545Elmwood Dr.
Petaluma, CA 94954
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Anita Brewer to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to abrewer

11/18/2014 08:49 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anita Brewer
310 N. Westlake Blvd. #260
Westlake Village, CA 91362

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rene Pineda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:46 AM
Please respond to rpineda 30

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rene Pineda
2000 Ivar #4
Hollywood, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ana Lopes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:45 AM
Please respond to anaclolopes

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ana Lopes
Sesimbra
Sesimbra, ot 02970
PT

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Mckee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:35 AM
Please respond to Pmckee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Mckee
21672 kaneohe lane
Huntington beach, CA 9263
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
linda b. to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:34 AM
Please respond to vegan 226

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

linda b.
397
pasadena, CA 91107
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christine Goodreau to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:34 AM
Please respond to e -g

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Transporting tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christine Goodreau
516 North Formosa Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Randall Phillips to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:34 AM
Please respond to madman 420randy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Randall Phillips
924 Dianne Street
Santa Ana, CA 92701
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
June Green to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:31 AM
Please respond to juneon 170

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

June Green
1640 Bleburn Drive
Belmont, CA 94002
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nikki Sachs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:27 AM
Please respond to nikkisachs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nikki Sachs
PO Box 11126
Berkeley, CA 94712
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joseph Thomas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:23 AM
Please respond to subcommandanteuno

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joseph Thomas
General Delivery
San Francisco, CA 94142
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sherri Decker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:19 AM
Please respond to Sherridecker 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sherri Decker
170 Blaine #203
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maria Sol Caro to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:18 AM
Please respond to sol _caro

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maria Sol Caro
700 Prospect Blvd
Pasadena, CA 91103
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Deborah Montero to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:14 AM
Please respond to luvsearth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Deborah Montero
9007 La Serena
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Zimmermann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:14 AM
Please respond to zwordsmith

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Zimmermann
P.O. Box 13031
Long Beach, CA 90803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debbie Williamson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:10 AM
Please respond to williamsondebbie 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debbie Williamson
P.O. Box 21
Mountain Home, AR 72654
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah Darnell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:05 AM
Please respond to Sarah .darnell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Darnell
215 E Eucalyptus st
Ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Holland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:05 AM
Please respond to maddogtoys

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Holland
768 Calabria Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lin Penrose to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:04 AM
Please respond to ljpenrose

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lin Penrose
6205 Toro Crk. Rd.
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Raymond to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:03 AM
Please respond to hampster

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

This seems to be a no-win situation. We are degrading more and more land and waterways with our endless need of oil. Keystone XL; Alaska's Beaufort and Chuchki (sp, sorry) seas' drilling proposals; tar sands transportation with inadequate safeguards... perhaps it's time to decide what kind of duture habitat for all species we're willing to live with : massive degradation of ecosystems, or investment in a cleaner future.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Raymond
7 Hidden Valley Rx
Monrovia, CA 91016
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Dixon to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ddixon 683
11/18/2014 08:03 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Dixon
1220 Lawton Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rena Lewis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 08:01 AM

Please respond to relew

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rena Lewis
1202 Loma
Ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karin Peck to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:58 AM
Please respond to atze

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karin Peck
6401 Coyle Ave
Carmichael, CA 95608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Circus Szalewski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:54 AM
Please respond to lacircus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Circus Szalewski
222 S Central Ave, #128
Los Angeles, CA 90012
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Glenn Knowles to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:42 AM
Please respond to glennknowles

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Glenn Knowles
1079 Goldenrod Lane
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
carol Hewitt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:31 AM
Please respond to hewitt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

carol Hewitt
La Montua 36
Marbella, CA 90755
ES

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jay brewer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:30 AM
Please respond to jbrewer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jay brewer
310 N Westlake Blvd Ste 260
Westlake Vlg, CA 91362
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lynda Sayre to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:29 AM
Please respond to lyndasayre

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynda Sayre
48310 Hwy One
Big Sur, CA 93920
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mindy Leighton -Toth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:29 AM
Please respond to eternalserena

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mindy Leighton-Toth
719 Cedar Point Place
Westlake Village, CA 91362
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mindy Leighton -Toth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:29 AM
Please respond to eternalserena

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mindy Leighton-Toth
719 Cedar Point Place
Westlake Village, CA 91362
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
molly perello to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:20 AM
Please respond to mmp 1865

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

molly perello
2030 Carriage Lane
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jan Kampa to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to happykampas

11/18/2014 07:11 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Kampa
3120 Hardin Way
Soquel, CA 95073
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roshanee Lappe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:07 AM
Please respond to roshanee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roshanee Lappe
2001 Artesia Blvd., Unit 315
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
margarita clayton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:07 AM
Please respond to claytonfm

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

margarita clayton
10392 mira vista drive
santa ana, CA 92705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pete Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:04 AM
Please respond to hanaupete

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pete Williams
642 S. 2nd Street, Apt. 1010
Louisville, KY 40202
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Constance Franklin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 07:01 AM
Please respond to cfjanuary

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Constance Franklin
808 1/2 Laguna Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kenneth Lapointe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:56 AM
Please respond to hawkvision

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kenneth Lapointe
2781 Mozart
Ottawa, ON K1T2P9
CA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steven Berman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:52 AM
Please respond to berm 0022

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steven Berman
2424 Spaulding AV #8
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Celeste Whitlow to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:48 AM
Please respond to whitlow .celeste

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Celeste Whitlow
Via Berros
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dani brusius to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:39 AM
Please respond to 3orangecat3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dani brusius
579 Aspen ridge ct
oak park, CA 91377
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Patty Linder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:35 AM
Please respond to patty 4282

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patty Linder
839 Bend
San Jose, CA 95136
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vanna Pichel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:22 AM
Please respond to vannapichel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vanna Pichel
2066 Lundberg Ave
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christeen Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:21 AM
Please respond to hope 4daisies

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christeen Anderson
4609 Top Flight Dr.
Crestview, FL 32539
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Allen Olson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:15 AM
Please respond to tctcdaboyz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Allen Olson
3632 3rd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephen Nong to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:13 AM
Please respond to freemen 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Nong
964 Balboa St.
Morro Bay, CA 93442
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
slava ra to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:12 AM
Please respond to sasha 7217

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

slava ra
318 3rd St
Eureka, CA, NM 87747
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pamela Hamilton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:10 AM
Please respond to pamelahamilton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pamela Hamilton
433 anchor lane
sacramento, CA 95605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Adrienne Tucker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:05 AM
Please respond to atucker 2573

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Adrienne Tucker
1053 Coleman Rd, Apt 1201
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debra Temple to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 06:02 AM
Please respond to debra .temple

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debra Temple
361 hollister ct.
san leandro, CA 94577
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Anne Bonneau to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:49 AM
Please respond to ambonneau

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anne Bonneau
240 Monroe Dr.
Mountain View, CA 94040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Pierce to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:45 AM
Please respond to ps _538779429

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Pierce
22R Taylor St
Gloucester, MA 01930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jason Colonel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:40 AM
Please respond to jason .colonel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jason Colonel
2605 Greenup St.
Covington, KY 41014
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Dempsey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:30 AM
Please respond to glassaviary

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Dempsey
424 Alhambra Street
Crockett, CA 94525
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephanie Wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:29 AM
Please respond to Meteors 777

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephanie Wilson
1412 cedar street
Arroyo grande, CA 93420

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maureen Forney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:20 AM
Please respond to mforney 2870

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maureen Forney
941 Bridge Road
San Leandro, CA 94577
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ben Oscar Andersson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:19 AM
Please respond to oscarsito 1057

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ben Oscar Andersson
55 My Street
My Hometown, IL 60601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marie Alabiso to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:16 AM
Please respond to Biscotti 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marie Alabiso
26 Dillinbgham Way
Plymouth, MA 02360
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joseph Klein to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to djoesefk

11/18/2014 05:15 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joseph Klein
700 East L St
Benicia, CA 94510
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robin Lindheimer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:10 AM
Please respond to Lindheimer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robin Lindheimer
2915 Mabel st
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
AniMae Chi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:04 AM
Please respond to sioux .01

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

AniMae Chi
Flora St
Adelaide, ot 5001
AU

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ana Mesner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 05:03 AM
Please respond to ana .mesner

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ana Mesner
Šercerjeva 3
Ljubljana, ot 1000
SI

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Richard Heimanson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:59 AM
Please respond to richard .heimanson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Heimanson
4457 Murietta Avenue
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Mayers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:57 AM
Please respond to mayerskat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Mayers
Burton Way
Los Angeles, CA 90050
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pagasa Valerio Serrano to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:51 AM
Please respond to katherinthesky

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pagasa Valerio Serrano
11439 Arlee Avenue
Norwalk, CA, CA 90650
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Peter Lee to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to peterboothlee

11/18/2014 04:24 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Peter Lee
3910 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lesley Hudak to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:19 AM
Please respond to elevenlights

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lesley Hudak
3 Rita Way
Orinda, CA 94563
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Alvarado to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:08 AM
Please respond to jimmyalv 327

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Alvarado
327gregory lane
pleasant hill, CA 94523
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dennis Ledden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 04:05 AM
Please respond to lcs 5779

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dennis Ledden
4545 Grinding Rock Rd
Fiddletown, CA 95629
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
JAKE SCHWARTZ to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 03:26 AM
Please respond to JakesLives

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

JAKE SCHWARTZ
152 Webster Street
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Burke to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to michaelanddianneb

11/18/2014 02:56 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Burke
1131 16th Street
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

George Reeves to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:17 AM
Please respond to george .reeves

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to demand you deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

7. I live next to these tracks and if I survive I will be seeking billions of

$$ in compensation from Pig Oil and whomever is responsible for continuing to use this stupid extract.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

George Reeves
721 Elaine Dr
Stockton, CA 95207
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amelia Zuckerwise to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 02:03 AM
Please respond to anzmichan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amelia Zuckerwise
1540 Oak Creek Drive
Palo Alto, CA 91302
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
thomas lavigne to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:57 AM
Please respond to thomaslavigne

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

thomas lavigne
adams avenue
fremont, CA 94538
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Daniella Gavriel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:55 AM
Please respond to dgavriel 11

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Daniella Gavriel
16701 Robert Lane
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frankie zamora to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:49 AM
Please respond to claygirl 69

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frankie zamora
403 n. catalina ave
pasadena, CA 91106
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rhona Baum to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:35 AM
Please respond to lapin -rb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rhona Baum
14593 Oak Street
Saratoga, CA 95070
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lisa Gray to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lisaegray

11/18/2014 01:26 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Gray
2227 E. Olmstead Way
Anaheim, CA 92806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Kittle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:22 AM
Please respond to redwdeons 50

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Kittle
POB 8205
Santa Cruz, CA 95061
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gabriel Steinfeld to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:18 AM
Please respond to gstein

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gabriel Steinfeld
693 Spruce St.
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gabriel Steinfeld to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:17 AM
Please respond to gstein

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gabriel Steinfeld
693 Spruce St.
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Steven Hernandez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 01:04 AM
Please respond to stevenhjr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steven Hernandez
1402 E. Florence Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dave Wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:58 AM
Please respond to wilsonhighlander

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dave Wilson
17705 Lakespring Ave
Palmdale, CA 93591
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shirley Gardner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:53 AM
Please respond to shirleygardner 42

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shirley Gardner
1771 Hester Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kimberley Schroder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:50 AM
Please respond to KimberleyDCS

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kimberley Schroder
3473 Shangri La Rd
Lafayette, CA 94549
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Charles Toms to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:48 AM
Please respond to eriktoms

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Charles Toms
925A Toro Canyon Rd.
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jeff Zittrain to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:48 AM
Please respond to ztrane

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeff Zittrain
1332 Russell St.
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eugene Majerowicz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:37 AM
Please respond to eugenemajerowicz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eugene Majerowicz
4449 Presidio Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90008
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cindy Valencia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:35 AM
Please respond to cindyv 11

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cindy Valencia
1812 Evergreen Avenue
West Sacramento, CA 95691
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michale Noll to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:30 AM
Please respond to garabaldi 001

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I strongly opposed this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michale Noll
4133 Wilkinson Ave.
Studio City, CA 91604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura Zanic to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:27 AM
Please respond to michlynn 1964

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura Zanic
1107 W West Ave
Fullerton, CA 92833
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tina H to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:21 AM
Please respond to tainab 25

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tina H
2
w, CA 94596
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Timothy Lawnicki to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:17 AM
Please respond to ngresonance

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Timothy Lawnicki
101 W Spring St. Unit E
Long Beach, CA 90806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Philip Simon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:12 AM
Please respond to philsim 75

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Philip Simon
Box 9473
san Rafael, CA 94912
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
adam kaplan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:10 AM
Please respond to adamkaplan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

adam kaplan
1244 victory walk
laguna beach, CA 92651
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
JUDITH WRIGHT to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:04 AM
Please respond to JUDITHA 11

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

JUDITH WRIGHT
2515 J Street #306
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Nicholes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:02 AM
Please respond to plugpositive

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Nicholes
6261 E. Fox Glen Dr
Anaheim, CA 92807
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vernon Faulkner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:01 AM
Please respond to vernmarj

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vernon Faulkner
POBox 2225
Pasadena, CA 91102
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Steven Fitzgerald to: p66-railspur-comments 11/18/2014 12:00 AM
Please respond to steve .st353

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steven Fitzgerald
398 Adams
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Greg Goodman to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to gregthegardener

11/17/2014 11:56 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Greg Goodman
4049 Chestnut Avenue
Concord, CA 94519
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jason Bowman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:55 PM
Please respond to xyamuchax

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jason Bowman
1525 Cold Springs Rd SPC 52
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jan Stewart to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:55 PM
Please respond to truebluejan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Stewart
14th
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alida Montanez -Salas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:55 PM
Please respond to amontana 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alida Montanez-Salas
14006 Edgewater Dr
Norwalk, CA 90650
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Therese DeBing to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:54 PM
Please respond to buddhabear 88

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Therese DeBing
935 Lighthouse Ave #14
pacific Grove, CA 93950

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lorie Maurer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:54 PM
Please respond to slo 707

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lorie Maurer
Del Rio Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mindi White to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:52 PM
Please respond to ammaze

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mindi White
PO Box 481185
Los Angeles, CA 90048
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Graham to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:43 PM
Please respond to patlgraham

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Graham
Burton Court
Danville, CA 94526
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Meislin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:42 PM
Please respond to purpleladybythebay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Meislin
po 1277
Tiburon, CA 94920
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Colleen Hamilton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:40 PM
Please respond to liza 72

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Colleen Hamilton
5744 Creekside
Orange, CA 92869
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Sherman to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to dsherman .design

11/17/2014 11:40 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Sherman
1923 Marin Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauren Schiffman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:38 PM
Please respond to crackmagazine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Schiffman
P.O. Box 1331
El Cerrito, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diana Morgan -Hickey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 PM
Please respond to dianamh

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diana Morgan-Hickey
520 Wagaman Drive
San Jose, CA 95129
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Roger Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:35 PM
Please respond to rasdsb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roger Smith
1628 Fairway Drive
Belmont, CA 94002
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
REBECCA GEISER to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:32 PM
Please respond to beckig 6

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

REBECCA GEISER
P. O. BOX 251396
GLENDALE, CA 91225
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kari Rose Parsell to : p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 PM

Please respond to kari

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kari Rose Parsell
416 San Miguel Way
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cyrle Perry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 PM
Please respond to cyrlebassoon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cyrle Perry
639 Miner Road
Orinda, CA 94563
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Danielle Curry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 PM
Please respond to beast 39

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Danielle Curry
319 Fuller Lane
Lincoln, CA 95648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
michael koch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 PM
Please respond to rojoroto 49

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

michael koch
3219 23rd st #5
san francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tony Bolo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 PM
Please respond to tonybolo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

LIES! LIES! LIES! with NO CONSEQUENCE!
STOP SUPPORTING ALL WARS!
STOP POISONING OUR PLANET!

Tony Bolo
5208 Wilkinson Ave.
N. Hollywood, CA 91607
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ron rediger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 PM
Please respond to rredi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ron rediger
25152 de wolfe rd
newhall, CA 91321
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathleen Koepp to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:20 PM
Please respond to kathopp

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Koepp
2368 Magda Circle
Thousand Oaks, CA 93428
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Donald Koepp to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:18 PM
Please respond to dkoe

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Donald Koepp
1550 Benson Avenue
Cambria, CA 93428
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michelle Benes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:16 PM
Please respond to mbenes 12

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michelle Benes
13080 Dronfield Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Rindlaub to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:11 PM
Please respond to rindlaub

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Rindlaub
716 sunset ave
Venice, CA 90291
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Oser to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:11 PM
Please respond to woser

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Oser
1439 Santa Fe Ave
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Indira Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:06 PM
Please respond to Indiratime

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Indira Smith
8834 Betty Way
West Hollywood, CA 90069
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lissa Coleman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:04 PM
Please respond to Lcol 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lissa Coleman
3051 Glendale Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lissa Coleman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:04 PM
Please respond to Lcol 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lissa Coleman
3051 Glendale Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roberto Romo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:02 PM
Please respond to neospyder 316

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roberto Romo
3227 Anza St.
San Francisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ron Goldman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:02 PM
Please respond to rgoldman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ron Goldman
1908 Alford Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Davidson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:57 PM
Please respond to lisaxxdavidson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in this town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Davidson
480 Mt. Wilson Trail
Sierra Madre, CA 91024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Dawson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:55 PM
Please respond to jdconstruction 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Dawson
260 Big Tree Ln
Watsonville, CA 95076
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Warner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:55 PM
Please respond to cyberpainter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Warner
Navellier Street
El Cerrito, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brian Weissbuch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:52 PM
Please respond to kw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Weissbuch
165 Tunstead Ave
San Anselmo, CA 94960
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Downey to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jamessdowney

11/17/2014 10:52 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Downey
Cherry Ave.
Lompoc, CA 93436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ana-Paula Fernandes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:51 PM
Please respond to Anapaulamfernandes

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ana-Paula Fernandes
705 Mendocino Way
Redwood City, CA 94065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vicki Wiker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:50 PM
Please respond to vwiker

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vicki Wiker
106 San Dimas
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sister Anandabodhi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:49 PM
Please respond to anandabodhi .tree

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sister Anandabodhi
2409 Tolowa Trail
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Erna Toback , PhD to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:48 PM
Please respond to erna .toback.phd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erna Toback, PhD
3243 Oakdell Rd.
Studio City, CA 91604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
CAROL LAMBERT to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:48 PM
Please respond to CAL 2675

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. Thank you for your consideration and positive action in this matter...

CAROL LAMBERT
40114 174TH ST EAST
LAKE LOS ANGELES, CA 93591
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marcia Kellam to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to Marciakellam

11/17/2014 10:48 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marcia Kellam
1237 humboldt street
Santa rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
betty winholtz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:47 PM
Please respond to winholtz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

betty winholtz
405 acacia
morro bay, CA 93442
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
JERRIE REINING to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:38 PM
Please respond to jreining

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

JERRIE REINING
longwalk
oakalnd, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anne Barker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:34 PM
Please respond to annenb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anne Barker
417 Woodland Ave.
San Rafael, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lily Sandoval to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:32 PM
Please respond to Spanky 1976

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lily Sandoval
325 Cordova
Pasadena, CA 91101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nicholas Esser to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:32 PM
Please respond to nichorus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nicholas Esser
1063 Balsamo Ave.
Simi Valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bruce Saltzer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:29 PM
Please respond to bsaltzer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Saltzer
755 Patterson Avenue
Glendale, CA 91202
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rolf Svehaug to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to esvehaug

11/17/2014 10:26 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rolf Svehaug
416 Trevethan Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jaime Currier to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:25 PM
Please respond to jaime .currier

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jaime Currier
2113 Rose St Apt 1
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
regula hess to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:22 PM
Please respond to regula .hess

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

regula hess
24 rue de ronquerolles
parmain, ot 95620
FR

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Richard Takagi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:21 PM
Please respond to Blindhawk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Takagi
1119 N Acacia Ave
Fullerton, CA 92831
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathie Kingett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:15 PM
Please respond to kingett .kathie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathie Kingett
807 West Road
La habra Hts, CA 90631
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shawn Williamson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:14 PM
Please respond to shawnw 768

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shawn Williamson
4242 Whitsett Ave
Studio City, CA 91604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Katherine Potter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:14 PM
Please respond to Kate .potter65

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Potter
4492 Sandalwood Drive
Pleasanton, CA 94588
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dee Lewke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:14 PM
Please respond to deelewke

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dee Lewke
12285 Alba Rd
ben Lomond, CA 95005
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Katrina Amsinger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:11 PM
Please respond to xsugarkatx

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katrina Amsinger
2505 Ocean View Pl
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Len Carella to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:11 PM
Please respond to Lmc 567

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Len Carella
3874 Sacramento street
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Crystal Strayer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:11 PM
Please respond to Mrs .CrystalS

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Crystal Strayer
7007 Arlington Pl
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erin Barca to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:09 PM
Please respond to kayucian

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erin Barca
1365 Creekside Dr. #429
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pollyana Harmon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:07 PM
Please respond to pollysung

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pollyana Harmon
1956 W. 230th Street
Torrance, CA 90501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Hazel MacKenzie to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:03 PM
Please respond to mackenzie 1281

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Hazel MacKenzie
6404 Whipporwill Street # 110
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tia Ja to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:01 PM
Please respond to Pandabluu

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tia Ja
14938 camden
San jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ron Riskin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 10:00 PM
Please respond to acusurfdoc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ron Riskin
891 Paseo Ferrelo
Santa Barbara, CA 93103
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Antoinette Sanchez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:57 PM
Please respond to tonimo 356

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Antoinette Sanchez
356 Via Coches
San Lorenzo, CA 94580
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Krupinski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:57 PM
Please respond to kkbluerose

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Krupinski
6124 Buena Vista Terrace
LA, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Kuczynski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:57 PM
Please respond to katski 47

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Kuczynski
25402 Shoshone Dr.
Lake Forest, CA 92630
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Anita Wisch to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to Awisch 629

11/17/2014 09:56 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anita Wisch
23709 Del Monte Drive
Valencia, CA 91355
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carolyn Spier to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:55 PM
Please respond to c .spier

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carolyn Spier
PO Box 1029
Weimar, CA 95736
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

George Cleveland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:55 PM
Please respond to george .cleveland

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

George Cleveland
713 Valley Way
Santa Clara, CA 95051
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dena Schwimmer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:54 PM
Please respond to shwark

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dena Schwimmer
1227 S. Genesee Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Ann Kelly & Family to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:53 PM
Please respond to besunflowersb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Ann Kelly & Family
1724 Olive Avenue
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Dane to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:52 PM
Please respond to barbara

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Dane
4191 Fvale
OAKLAND, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Paul Meyer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:52 PM
Please respond to pdmeyer 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paul Meyer
4393 Fieldcrest Dr
El Sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Heather Buske to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:51 PM
Please respond to tathaaloka

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Buske
5010 GRANGE RD
SANTA ROSA, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jamie Rosenblood to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:50 PM
Please respond to jamie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jamie Rosenblood
12235 Gorham Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90049
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Binh Tang to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:49 PM
Please respond to overrice

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Binh Tang
20126 Runnymede St. #24
Winnetka, CA 91306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Renee Boteilho to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:48 PM
Please respond to tmrbcats

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Renee Boteilho
1400 N. Martel Ave. #101
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mariano Marquez III to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:46 PM
Please respond to mario

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mariano Marquez III
955 Bay Shore Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jennifer Harrison to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:44 PM
Please respond to jenniferclairesf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Harrison
1396 Sanchez Street
San Francisco, CA 94131
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John & Judi Satchell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:43 PM
Please respond to satchelljohn 29

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John & Judi Satchell
9850 N. River Rd.
San Miguel, CA 93451
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
LAwrence Carbary to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:40 PM
Please respond to L .carbary

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

LAwrence Carbary
80 OrA Way
San Francisco, CA 94131
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
The Rev. Allan B. Jones to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:37 PM
Please respond to revabjones

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands oil to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town (and probably your a well) just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains, and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft evaluates only rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. Thank you.

The Rev. Allan B. Jones
722 Orchard Street #2
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brittany App to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:35 PM
Please respond to brittany

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brittany App
6905 Marchant Ave
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Billie Gordon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:34 PM
Please respond to billiegordon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Billie Gordon
15851 Izorah Way
Los Gatos, CA 95032
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jennifer Hayes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:33 PM
Please respond to xandysmom

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Hayes
2312 St. James Pl.
Modesto, CA 95350
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephen Hutchinson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:33 PM
Please respond to shutchin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Hutchinson
849 Omar Street
Glendale, CA 91202
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robertta Clarke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:32 PM
Please respond to psredpoppy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robertta Clarke
14122 Seven Acres Lane - DO NOT SEND MAIL
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kari Walters to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:31 PM
Please respond to kariw 310

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kari Walters
1441 Palisades Drive
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Tova to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:31 PM
Please respond to susantova

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Tova
1333 Edison
Santa Ynez, CA 93460
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Arnold Schildhaus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:31 PM
Please respond to jamaps

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arnold Schildhaus
413 Grenoble Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Linda Trevillian to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:31 PM
Please respond to linda -in-alhambra

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Trevillian
2216 Westminster Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Abbie Bates to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to abbiebates

11/17/2014 09:30 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Abbie Bates
3706 Motor Avenue #35
Los Angeles, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Zach Glanz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:29 PM
Please respond to redfeathers 47

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Zach Glanz
3362 Savage Avenue
Pinole, CA 94564
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Heather Richman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:29 PM

Please respond to heathr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Richman
333 Castle Drive
Santa Cruz, CA 95065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lana Touchstone to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:28 PM
Please respond to lanatouchstone

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lana Touchstone
252 Grapewood St
Vallejo, CA 94591
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Katherine Andrews , PhD to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:27 PM
Please respond to 4benedictions

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Andrews, PhD
5858 Morgan Pl., Apt.10
Stockton, CA 95219
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Irene Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:25 PM
Please respond to irenebrown

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Irene Brown
985 Campbell Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Seda Z Arnold to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:23 PM
Please respond to sedaz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Seda Z Arnold
1909 Nero Court
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sabrina Sarne to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:21 PM
Please respond to sab _nysa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sabrina Sarne
Mustang
Danville, CA 94526
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erica Hummel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:21 PM
Please respond to ericahummel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erica Hummel
7912 Ronald Drive
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steve Eklund to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:20 PM
Please respond to seklund

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Eklund
51 Nacional St.
Salinas, CA 93901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janice Clark to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:19 PM
Please respond to obsjlc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janice Clark
5413 South Orcas st
Seattle, WA 98118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M. Olson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:18 PM
Please respond to Olson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M. Olson
Bryan
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michelle MacKenzie to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to michellehmackenzie
11/17/2014 09:17 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michelle MacKenzie
2607 Graceland Ave
San Carlos, CA 94070
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah Mundal to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:16 PM
Please respond to sarah .b.mundal

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Mundal
744 Pacheco St.
San Francisco, CA 94116
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Leihy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:16 PM
Please respond to sleihy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Leihy
5763 Owl Light a Terrace
Santa Rosa, CA 95409
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Victoria Flamenco to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:11 PM
Please respond to twid 1984

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Victoria Flamenco
1075 Space Park Way, Spc 331
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Julie Wheelock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:07 PM
Please respond to juliewheelock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julie Wheelock
Bluebell lWay
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Helen Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:06 PM
Please respond to hj _swampgirl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Helen Johnson
7922 Santa Ana Rd
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Manildi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:03 PM
Please respond to gmanildi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Manildi
6158 Olvera Ct.
Chino, CA 91710
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
clayton masters to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:01 PM
Please respond to claymasters

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

clayton masters
161 east mason street
azusa, CA 91702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Natalie Flores -Rios to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 09:01 PM
Please respond to nattlesf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Natalie Flores-Rios
827 East Promenade Unit D
Azusa, CA 91702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Varga to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:59 PM
Please respond to jlvarga 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Varga
21331 Veleta Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
S S to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:58 PM
Please respond to smitha _srinivasa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

S S
1234 Anystreet Ave
Anytown, CA 90048
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
L. Diaz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:56 PM
Please respond to conexionclara

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

L. Diaz
2460 22nd. Street
SF, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jessica Likens to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:52 PM
Please respond to leobufyfan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jessica Likens
8137 Santa Inez Way
Buena Park, CA 90620
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Terry S.C. to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:52 PM
Please respond to dlpotc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Terry S.C.
McCloud
Santa Maria, CA 93455
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sharon Barrett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:51 PM
Please respond to sbarrett 24

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Barrett
2369 Valley West Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael House to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:48 PM
Please respond to macross

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael House
114 Nimitz Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94061
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Luis Garcia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:48 PM
Please respond to lg 984556

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Luis Garcia
1831 w Glen Ave Apt. 1
Anaheim, CA 92801
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Matthew Palmer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:47 PM
Please respond to mattpalm

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Palmer
5209 E Peabody St
Long Beach, CA 90808
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Paige Book to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:47 PM
Please respond to pbookpg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paige Book
107 14th Street
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jonathan Chu to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:47 PM
Please respond to asian _tiger

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jonathan Chu
40881 Valero Drive
Fremont, CA 94539
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Steve Robey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:45 PM
Please respond to steve .robey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Robey
548 Wildcat Canyon Road
Berkeley, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Lacy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:43 PM
Please respond to Earthhrt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Lacy
536 so. Main st.
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Torrisi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:41 PM
Please respond to satvet

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Torrisi
921 Pecho St
Morro Bay, CA 93442
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Veronica Bowers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:40 PM
Please respond to Vlbowers

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Veronica Bowers
8050 elphick rd
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joseph Belli to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:38 PM
Please respond to jprbelli

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joseph Belli
22100 Pacheco Pass Hwy.
Hollister, CA 95023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William Barthen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:36 PM
Please respond to wbzoo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Barthen
145 N. Pass Avenue
Burbank, CA 91505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Harold Mann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:36 PM
Please respond to haroldmann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Harold Mann
1751 Balsa Ave
San Jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
susanne mortensen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:34 PM
Please respond to mavedanser

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

susanne mortensen
1722 westcliff dr
newport beach, CA 92660
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
s b to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:33 PM
Please respond to birthpagan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

s b
don't ask for this
don't ask for this, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Abram Perlstein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:32 PM
Please respond to ap 3dguy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Abram Perlstein
1852 6th Street
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debi Bylin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:30 PM
Please respond to debibylin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debi Bylin
1035 Castle Rock Road
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

steve swersky to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to steveswersky

11/17/2014 08:29 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

steve swersky
1352 aster lane
livermore, CA 94551
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ayya Santacitta to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:28 PM
Please respond to sr .santacitta

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ayya Santacitta
2409 Tolowa Trail
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
J. Holley Taylor to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:28 PM
Please respond to cbd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

J. Holley Taylor
PO Box 1987
Penn Valley, CA 95946
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
J Acosta to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:26 PM
Please respond to elise .acosta

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

J Acosta
243 San Carlos Avenue
Sausalito, CA 94965
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John David Stendahl to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:25 PM
Please respond to Jdfstendahl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John David Stendahl
1390 N. Puente St.
Brea, CA 92821
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carmina Stendahl to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:21 PM
Please respond to Minas _mail

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carmina Stendahl
1390 N. Puente St.
Brea, CA 92821

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Dorsi to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to dorsilaw

11/17/2014 08:21 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Dorsi
2710 Branch Mill Road
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shannon Healey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:21 PM
Please respond to sh 2424

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shannon Healey
425 Walnut St Apt 1
San Carlos, CA 94070
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tom Amick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:21 PM
Please respond to Tomamick

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tom Amick
1061 Nordman Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Geana Radiev to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:20 PM
Please respond to basidioma

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Geana Radiev
1811 H St #4
Sacramento, CA 95811
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Hiestand to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:20 PM
Please respond to nancya 0624

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Hiestand
526 South Campus Way, Davis
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ingrid Brewer to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ingridbrewer 8

11/17/2014 08:17 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ingrid Brewer
4991 Read Rd
Thousand Oaks, CA 93021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Dunbar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:16 PM
Please respond to jdunbar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Dunbar
1137 Delno Avenue
San Jose, CA 95126
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John David Stendahl to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:16 PM
Please respond to Jdfstendahl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John David Stendahl
1390 N Puente St
Brea, CA 92821
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joyce frye to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:16 PM
Please respond to joycefkenw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joyce frye
122 ratto road
alameda, CA 94502
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ROBERT ATKINSON to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:13 PM
Please respond to rtext 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ROBERT ATKINSON
13659 VICTORY BLVD
VAN NUYS, CA 91401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
wendy hastings to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:13 PM
Please respond to wendy .hastings

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

wendy hastings
4244 fulton
sf, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cheryl Snell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:12 PM
Please respond to Vessel 0

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cheryl Snell
1708 Prospect ave
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
pam plummer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:10 PM
Please respond to pjplummer 493

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

pam plummer
3261 claremore ave
long beach, CA 90808
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Matt Bango to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:07 PM
Please respond to mattbango

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matt Bango
1300 Oak Creek Drive #316
Palo Alto, CA 94304
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K talbot to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:07 PM
Please respond to katal 8813

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K talbot
po box 4487
Foster City, CA 94404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mark Ogonowski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:06 PM
Please respond to mogo 666

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Ogonowski
10483 New Haven Street
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dorothy J. Clazie to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:05 PM

Please respond to domiso

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dorothy J. Clazie
9
Daly City, CA, CA 94014
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mike Kane to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:01 PM
Please respond to Rebelx 0024

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mike Kane
1229 N Mansfield Ave
Hollywood, CA 90038
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Diana Pope to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to dianampope

11/17/2014 08:01 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diana Pope
5880 Quail Ridge Way
Auburn, CA 95602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Deirdre Mullin to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to dmullin 1219

11/17/2014 08:00 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Deirdre Mullin
2379 Prune St
Pinole, CA 94564
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Candy LeBlanc to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 08:00 PM
Please respond to telvari 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Candy LeBlanc
1525 Cold Springs Rd SPC 52
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Stebbins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:57 PM
Please respond to bstebbins 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Stebbins
1505 Keoncrest Dr
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Brueder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:56 PM
Please respond to Bruederism

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Brueder
510 N JACKSON ST
GLENDALE, CA 91206
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
rachele mechem to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:56 PM
Please respond to rachele

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

rachele mechem
2020 Market St
san francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jennifer Sellers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:55 PM
Please respond to buckingham 72

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Sellers
3901 Clayton Rd.#66
Concord, CA 94521
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Rothkrug to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:55 PM
Please respond to rothkrug

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Rothkrug
158 mgc
cm, CA 94925
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rebecca White to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:52 PM
Please respond to Rebecca

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rebecca White
855 La Playa
San Francisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Patricia Albers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:50 PM
Please respond to palbers 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Albers
280 N. Orchard Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
marc silverman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:50 PM
Please respond to dhalgrn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

marc silverman
6030 graciosa dr
la, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
m g to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:49 PM
Please respond to meagen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

m g
12 university ave
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sarah brady to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:48 PM
Please respond to srab 128

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sarah brady
928 parkman ave
los angeles, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karen Donaldson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to kdonaldson

11/17/2014 07:47 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Donaldson
PO Box 3215
Grass Valley, CA 95945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Magrath to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:46 PM
Please respond to phatmcass

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Magrath
1435 Ledgestone Lane
Pomona, CA 91767
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tupefaavae Auelua to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:46 PM
Please respond to Tupeauelua

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tupefaavae Auelua
12549 Heron Street
Victorville, CA 92392
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alison Ellsworth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:45 PM
Please respond to alisonre

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alison Ellsworth
500 Stanyan St.
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alberto Acosta to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:44 PM
Please respond to aacosta 756

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alberto Acosta
235 N Valley St. Apt. 224
Burbank, CA 91505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Willow Myers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:43 PM
Please respond to dwmn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Willow Myers
102 Carter Dr.
Bellingham, WA 98225
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Oda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:42 PM
Please respond to Jandjoda

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Oda
2000 post
San francisco, CA 94115
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erica Stanojevic to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:42 PM
Please respond to ericast

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erica Stanojevic
611 CENTENNIAL ST
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tim Oben to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:42 PM
Please respond to tim .oben

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tim Oben
7553 Brigadoon Way
Dublin, CA 94568
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jan Lochner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:42 PM
Please respond to 4lochs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jan Lochner
3710 Hicks Road
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Penney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:41 PM
Please respond to Granniejannie 49

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Penney
6524 Markley way
Carmichael, CA 95608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nan Wollman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:41 PM
Please respond to nan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nan Wollman
4500 1/2 Homer St
Los Angeles, CA 90031
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Eister to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:38 PM
Please respond to meister

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Eister
815 Willow Lane
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Barnes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:38 PM
Please respond to sharonlb 88

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Barnes
16110 Ventura Blvd.
Encino, CA 91436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jan Edmunds to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:37 PM
Please respond to Jannieoakley

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shut them out completely until they hugely clean up their act and make transport safer, and stop making us sick and killing us. And NO TAR SANDS at all ever, never. No blood money for dirty oil.

Jan Edmunds
37 Oak Park Dr.
Alameda, CA 94502
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen West to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:32 PM
Please respond to kwest 25

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen West
2101 Ponderosa Street
Santa Ana, CA 92705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bhikkhu Bodhi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:31 PM
Please respond to venbodhi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bhikkhu Bodhi
2020 Route 301
Carmel, NY 10512
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rose Marie Menard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:30 PM
Please respond to rmmenard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rose Marie Menard
460 South Batavia Street
Orange, CA 92868
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Victor de Vlaming to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:29 PM
Please respond to vicdv

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Victor de Vlaming
3942 Terra Vista Way
Sacramento, CA 95821
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Gary Thomsen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:29 PM
Please respond to thomsens

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gary Thomsen
1721 Miramar
Newport Beach, CA 92661
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Heather Grigsby to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:29 PM
Please respond to blur .all.the.lines

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Grigsby
8064 Alma Mesa Way
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brett Jensen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:22 PM
Please respond to Hillsidesidefarms

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brett Jensen
700 Picaacho Drive
La Habra Heights, CA 90631
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Denise Hill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:21 PM
Please respond to faire

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Denise Hill
317 Tenth Street
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maureen Forney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:21 PM
Please respond to mforney 2870

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maureen Forney
941 Bridge Road
San Leandro, CA 94577
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Merris Weber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:20 PM
Please respond to merrisweber

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Merris Weber
1720 S Hobart Bl
LA, CA 90006
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Angel Reed to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:19 PM
Please respond to angelhaydn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Angel Reed
161 Lower Terrace
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Roxanne Moger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:18 PM
Please respond to roxNne .l.moger

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roxanne Moger
2340 42nd St
sacramento, CA 95817
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Reeta Roo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:18 PM
Please respond to roocooncardoon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Reeta Roo
PO Box 875
Occidental, CA 95465
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Phillip Browne to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to philberts

11/17/2014 07:17 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Phillip Browne
P.O. Box 7536
Menlo Park, CA 94026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Katie Spurlock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:16 PM
Please respond to fenna 66

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katie Spurlock
665 Pine St
SF, CA 94108
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Isaac Dowd to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:14 PM
Please respond to gandalf 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Isaac Dowd
599 Spruce St.
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pamela LaRue to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to pkayelarue

11/17/2014 07:14 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pamela LaRue
3703 Hackett Ave
Long Beach, CA, CA 90808
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laurel Brewer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:11 PM
Please respond to magickhours

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurel Brewer
4991 Read Rd
Moorpark, CA 93021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sara Rosenbrock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:09 PM
Please respond to sara _jane22

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sara Rosenbrock
Crow Canyon Rd
Castro Valley, CA 94552
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laurel Wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:07 PM
Please respond to union 4lw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurel Wilson
107 Sycamore St. Unit 101
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ginny Hanson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ginnyrayhanson

11/17/2014 07:07 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ginny Hanson
1518 S. Wilton Pl #401
Los Angeles, CA 90019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marsha Lowry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:07 PM
Please respond to Ms .Marsha-V-L

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marsha Lowry
1070 Mitchell Way
El Sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathleen Fox to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:06 PM
Please respond to kathleenl .fox

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Fox
381 Saratoga Ave # B
Grover Beach, CA 93433
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mikail Barron to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:05 PM
Please respond to icebear

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mikail Barron
110 Arrow Ln.
Felton, CA 95018
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Cogswell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:05 PM
Please respond to davendes

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Cogswell
595 Arguello Blvd
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Allan Chen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:04 PM
Please respond to feldspar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Allan Chen
111 Shepardson Lane
Alameda, CA 94502
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elaine Mont-Eton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:04 PM

Please respond to bears 2398

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elaine Mont-Eton
83 Billou Street
San Rafael, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jean Gize to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:03 PM
Please respond to gizej 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jean Gize
5562 Le Fevre Dr
San Jose, CA 95118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Deb Buckler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:03 PM
Please respond to gotrandy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

No way! They tracks run right through the heart of Paso Robles, Atascadero, Santa Margurita, and San Luis. NO, NO, No!

Deb Buckler
1650 Traffic Way
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
C Ruth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:03 PM
Please respond to Carolruth 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

C Ruth
661 cabrillo
Stanford, CA 94305
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sharman Saffier to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:02 PM
Please respond to sharmansaffiermft

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharman Saffier
2005 Cedar Ridge Drive
Stockton, CA 95207
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Clarke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:02 PM
Please respond to lisa 3131

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Clarke
po box 277
Fairfax, CA 94978
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sheri Hill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:01 PM
Please respond to Rxrus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheri Hill
2412
Santa maria, CA 93458
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tung Vu to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:00 PM
Please respond to vutung

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tung Vu
3687 Greenlee Dr Apt 2
San Jose, CA 95117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Greg Ludwig to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 07:00 PM
Please respond to gl 21

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Greg Ludwig
2515 Solano Rd.
Shell Beach, CA 93449
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jodi Frediani to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:58 PM
Please respond to JodiFredi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jodi Frediani
1015 Smith Grade
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shoshanah McKnight to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:58 PM
Please respond to shosh

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shoshanah McKnight
324 Berkeley Way
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Katherine Zelaya to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:58 PM
Please respond to kathy .z

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Zelaya
337 W California Ave., Unit 6
GLENDALE, CA 91203
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ellen Koivisto to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:57 PM

Please respond to offstage

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ellen Koivisto
1556 Great Hwy #101
San Francisco, CA 94122
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

carrie snyder to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to carrieasnyder

11/17/2014 06:56 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

carrie snyder
1435 Mills Court
Menlo Park, CA 94025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paul aagaard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:56 PM
Please respond to pik .and

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paul aagaard
3801 old conejo rd
newbury park, CA 91320
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Hunter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:54 PM
Please respond to ursidadefan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Hunter
12021 Gold Poine Lane
Gold River, CA 95670
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Miryam Bachrach to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:54 PM
Please respond to miryamb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miryam Bachrach
8717 Airdrome Street
Los Angeles, CA 90035
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Craig Hamann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:54 PM
Please respond to cardiac _shock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Craig Hamann
734 East Magnolia Blvd. #C
Burbank, CA 91501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susaan Aram to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:54 PM
Please respond to mermaidlaguna

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susaan Aram
1361 Terrace Way
Laguna Beach, CA 92651
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
A D to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:54 PM
Please respond to bunny

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

A D
414 Orchard Dr.
Burbank, CA 91506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jon erickson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:53 PM
Please respond to jonjerickson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jon erickson
4011 57th St.
Sacramento, CA 95820
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ann Gould Massoubre to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:52 PM
Please respond to bodhababe

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Gould Massoubre
2053 Fillmore
San Francisco, CA 94123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pamela Ball to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:52 PM
Please respond to plball

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pamela Ball
404 Joaquin Ave
San Leandro, CA 94577
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dorothy Varellas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:52 PM
Please respond to djvarellas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dorothy Varellas
35 C
SF, CA 94124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Rosenfeld to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:51 PM
Please respond to houseofhats

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Rosenfeld
4924 tujunga ave
n.hollywod, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amy Christenson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:51 PM
Please respond to mybluedragonfly

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amy Christenson
1419 Waring St.
Seaside, CA 93955
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Catherine George to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:50 PM
Please respond to cathygeorge

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Catherine George
1836 Locust Street
Napa, CA 94559
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Parkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:48 PM
Please respond to snikrap

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Parkins
4285 GilbertSt
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura DeYoung to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:48 PM
Please respond to santussika

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Please understand how deeply we care about this issue. We need to move away from fossil fuels in general and specifically to stop contaminating our biosphere further through extreme fossil fuel extraction methods. Please help ensure the safety of all of us along the railroad line and all of us in California and on this planet.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers

fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura DeYoung
497 Sierra Vista Ave. Apt 4
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Kleeman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:48 PM
Please respond to pkleeman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Kleeman
126 B Upham St.
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elfi Gilford to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to elfigilford

11/17/2014 06:45 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elfi Gilford
107 Edith Street
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rea Freedom to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:44 PM
Please respond to Realfe

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rea Freedom
19760 Oakmont Dr.
Los a Gatos, CA 95033
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ms. Lilith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:43 PM
Please respond to ladycat 76

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ms. Lilith
3060 Channel Dr., #8
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan Trivisonno to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:43 PM
Please respond to susan _trivisonno

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

As a concerned citizen and frequent visitor to the area, I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk at any time but especially in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Trivisonno
2810 Oak Estates Ct
San Jose, CA 95135
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sunny williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:41 PM
Please respond to rumba 2tango

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sunny williams
2256 stokes
San jose, CA 95128
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jamila g . to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:39 PM
Please respond to jamila

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jamila g.
620 E St
petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
theresa fassett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:39 PM
Please respond to circle 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

theresa fassett
2170 tower rd
williamstown, VT 05679
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:39 PM
Please respond to tangosteve

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Anderson
3851 Gaines Ct.
Simi Valley, CA 93063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Rinnander to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:38 PM
Please respond to pinicola

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Rinnander
958 Lighthouse Way
Port Hueneme, CA 93041
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristin Riggs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:37 PM
Please respond to kriggs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristin Riggs
1380 48th Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Astrid Giese -Zimmer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:36 PM
Please respond to Coolast 87

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Astrid Giese-Zimmer
El Camino Real
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Matthew Swyers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:35 PM
Please respond to mswyers

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Swyers
1020 Dolores St. #28
Livermore, CA 94550
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

nadine chatel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:35 PM
Please respond to nadine .chatel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nadine chatel
12 rue j-b clément
GENTILLY, ot 94250
FR

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Sims to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:33 PM
Please respond to nanrightnow

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Sims
LaFortua
Newbury Park, CA 91320
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Craig Rakela to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:33 PM
Please respond to crakela

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Craig Rakela
1133-55th Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Olivia Eielson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:26 PM
Please respond to olivia 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Olivia Eielson
6817 Colton Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Aldon Fruge to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:26 PM
Please respond to afruge 47

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Aldon Fruge
1825 Shoreline Dr #306
Alameda, CA 94501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debora Sayre to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sayredk

11/17/2014 06:24 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debora Sayre
1154 Hazel Drive
Pinole, CA 94564
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Porter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:24 PM
Please respond to susansporter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Porter
1870 Newport Ave
Pasadena, CA 91103
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Teri Sigler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:23 PM
Please respond to siglert

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Teri Sigler
100 Shaffer Road
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jessica C . Kroontje to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:22 PM
Please respond to jckroontje 32378

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jessica C. Kroontje
P. O. Box 4271
Modesto, CA 95352
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Junko Lee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:21 PM
Please respond to junco -bird

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Junko Lee
13801 Shirley St. Unit 45
Garden Grove, CA 92843
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
MICHAEL Toobert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:21 PM
Please respond to toobie 0535

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

MICHAEL Toobert
212 MALLARD DR
GRASS VALLEY, CA 95945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Keith Chambers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:20 PM
Please respond to khcham

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Keith Chambers
1820 Capitol Avenue Apt 204
Sacramento, CA 95811
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rob Elia to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to robertelia

11/17/2014 06:20 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rob Elia
1285 Bollinger Canyon Rd.
Moraga, CA 94556
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Terry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:20 PM
Please respond to michaelgterry

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth from Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Terry
503 W. Rustic Rd.
Santa Monica, CA 90402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rohana Rice to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:18 PM
Please respond to rosrice

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rohana Rice
72 Holstrom Circle
Novato, CA 94947
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paul kep to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:17 PM
Please respond to kepster 925

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paul kep
123 main
concord, CA 94520
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gina ortiz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:11 PM
Please respond to ginarina

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gina ortiz
rockmont
claremont, CA 91711
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diane Berliner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:09 PM
Please respond to canyongal

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diane Berliner
2160 Laurel Canyon Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alice Weigel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:09 PM
Please respond to awiggle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alice Weigel
112 Terry Loop
Watsonville, CA 95076
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mayumi Knox to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:09 PM
Please respond to Mayumi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mayumi Knox
1075 Old Mill Rd.
San Marino, CA 91108
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carolyn McLuskie to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mcluskiec

11/17/2014 06:08 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carolyn McLuskie
28128 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Cornish to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:08 PM
Please respond to crc 426

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Cornish
P.O. Box 14862
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Feissel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:07 PM
Please respond to johnfeissel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Feissel
2055 Range Ave., #345
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauren Dykman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:05 PM
Please respond to bioverse

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Dykman
732 Embarcadero Del Norte
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Webster to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:04 PM
Please respond to Plswebster 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Webster
6355 green valley circle
Culver city, CA 90230
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Mickle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:03 PM
Please respond to chanyen .0

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Mickle
1820 Capitol Ave Apt 701
Sacramento, CA 95811
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steph clark to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 06:00 PM
Please respond to scrayess

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steph clark
1894 premier
Concord, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
miriam Slater to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:56 PM
Please respond to mimslater

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

miriam Slater
2745 el prado rd
santa barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

nancy hartman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:56 PM
Please respond to bikegirlnancy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nancy hartman
839 Mariposa Rd.
lafayette, CA 94549
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jay Chenoweth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:55 PM
Please respond to Elephant 3352

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jay Chenoweth
4730 Marconi ave
Carmichael, CA 95608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Laurie Garrett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:55 PM
Please respond to lauriegarrett .cc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurie Garrett
16 Penny Lane
Fairfax, CA 94930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barry Kaufman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:54 PM
Please respond to barrykaufman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barry Kaufman
936 N. Keystone St.
Burbank, CA 91506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ann M to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:54 PM
Please respond to annmyers 12

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann M
Webster St
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Fiona Priskich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:53 PM
Please respond to fionapriskich

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Fiona Priskich
41 Beresford Gardens
Swan View, CA 90210
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Page to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:53 PM
Please respond to nanpage

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.
OIL TANKER TRAINS DO NOT BELONG ON OUR BEAUTIFUL PRECIOUS CENTRAL COAST!!

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Page
1712 Lynn Drive
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Riegle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:53 PM
Please respond to eriegle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Riegle
480 Lytton Ave Ste 9
Palo Alto, CA 94301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eric Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:52 PM
Please respond to etrekker

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eric Smith
647 cree
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura Likover to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:52 PM
Please respond to jeanlikover

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura Likover
413 Carter Street
Vallejo, CA 94590
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
don meehan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:50 PM
Please respond to d .h-meehan_1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

don meehan
1714 merrill dr
san jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jere Wilkerson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:50 PM
Please respond to mrswilk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jere Wilkerson
1680 Linden Ct.
Cambria, CA 93428
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Craig Cook to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:49 PM
Please respond to craigecook

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Craig Cook
129 Sequoia Circle
SantaRosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
glenn embrey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:49 PM
Please respond to gtembrey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

glenn embrey
voorhees ave
redondo beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Wiesner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:49 PM
Please respond to jcwiesner

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Wiesner
P.O. Box 20159
Castro Valley, CA 94546
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Karchem to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:49 PM
Please respond to dkarchem

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Karchem
20000 Romar St.
Chatsworth, CA 91311
US

Protect Our Towns , REJECT Oil Train Expansion

George Allerton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:49 PM
Please respond to gcolby 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

George Allerton
235 Main St. #318
Venice, CA 90291
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sheila Gholson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sheilagholson

11/17/2014 05:49 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheila Gholson
2271 Dartmouth
Palo Alto, CA 94306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ilse Hadda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:48 PM
Please respond to ilseH

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ilse Hadda
1440 Walnut Street #5
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Margarita Perez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:47 PM

Please respond to marjor

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margarita Perez
13859 Graber Ave
Sylmar, CA 91342
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ralph Lopez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:47 PM
Please respond to santiago -69

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ralph Lopez
121 So. Hope St. #332, 332
Los Angeles, CA 90012
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dessa Kaye to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:46 PM
Please respond to dlkaye

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought. As we've seen in countless recent oil spill disasters, the industry consistently underestimates the chances and scope of accidents. Their "emergency response" plans are notoriously out-of-date and ineffective.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dessa Kaye
P.O.Box 1397
s, CA 91614
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elaine Andrianos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:45 PM
Please respond to eandrianos

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elaine Andrianos
12922 Union Ave #204
HAWTHORNE, CA 90250
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Claudia Wornum to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:45 PM
Please respond to claudiawornum

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Claudia Wornum
11780 Cranford Way
Oakland, CA 94605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
R Wells to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:42 PM
Please respond to tigerwells

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

R Wells
442 S. Alexandria Ave #1
Los Angeles, CA 90020
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steve Pryputniewicz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:41 PM
Please respond to kapoosta

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Pryputniewicz
8427 Park Ave.
Forestville, CA 95436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Julie Katayama to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:40 PM
Please respond to jkatayama

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julie Katayama
7115 Ashley Dr.
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ROLLIN BLANTON to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:37 PM
Please respond to rollin .blanton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ROLLIN BLANTON
315 w. 5th st
Los Angeles, CA 90013
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Petrea Sandel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:37 PM
Please respond to aertep

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Petrea Sandel
551 Eldora Road
Pasadena, CA 91104
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
NICK MCLAUGHLIN to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:37 PM
Please respond to MADLABCAP

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

NICK MCLAUGHLIN
7401 S SEPULVEDA BLVD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Staci Evans to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:36 PM
Please respond to sabovill

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Staci Evans
3720 Rock Island Dr.
Sacramento, CA 95827
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:36 PM
Please respond to electricista 545

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Johnson
5804 Alameda Ave
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
B Diane Fowler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:35 PM
Please respond to roboroxie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

B Diane Fowler
307 Sunnyside Dr.
Colfax, CA 95713
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

henry sanchez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:34 PM
Please respond to hsanchez

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

henry sanchez
963 oso rd
ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Hollis to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to bchollis

11/17/2014 05:34 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Hollis
18 Locust Avenue
Kentfield, CA 94904
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ellen Hamilton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:34 PM
Please respond to ellen .hamilton5

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ellen Hamilton
7005 Scripps Crescent St
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

David Lloyd to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:33 PM
Please respond to david .w.lloyd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Lloyd
1520 Stanford Ave
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kay Fontana to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to kayfontana

11/17/2014 05:32 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kay Fontana
2143 Coastland Ave
San Jose, CA 95125
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karen Minkowski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:32 PM
Please respond to karen .minkowski

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Minkowski
2395 Delaware Ave. #66
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Roger Kohler to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to rmkohler 88

11/17/2014 05:31 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roger Kohler
38 N Almaden Blvd Unit 1623
San Jose, CA 95110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ali Moshrefi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:29 PM
Please respond to arm _1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ali Moshrefi
25013 Whitman St 10s
Hayward, CA 94544
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jean Crossley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:29 PM
Please respond to Jcrossley 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jean Crossley
Box 1185
Winters, CA 95694
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Steve Schubert to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to s _schub1

11/17/2014 05:28 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Schubert
Po Box 6002
Los Osos, CA 93412
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathryn Burns to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:26 PM
Please respond to burnszilla

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathryn Burns
5781 Los Pacos St.
Buena Park, CA 90620
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Janice Jones to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:26 PM
Please respond to jan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janice Jones
2612 Tulare Av
El Cerrito, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura Huhn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:25 PM
Please respond to laura

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura Huhn
1
Bodega Bay, CA 94923
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Holden Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:25 PM
Please respond to Nedloh 40

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Holden Smith
228A E. Figueroa
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Selina L to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:24 PM
Please respond to icanflutter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Selina L
Huntingdon Drive
San Jose, CA 95129
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diana Dee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:24 PM
Please respond to DianahtIne

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diana Dee
12814 Victory Bl
North Hollywood, CA 91606
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Reevyn Aronson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:23 PM
Please respond to reevyn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Reevyn Aronson
2802 Medford Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94061
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paul caarlton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:23 PM
Please respond to pfcsage

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paul caarlton
3280 Paseo Gallita
san clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Borucke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:22 PM
Please respond to michael .jborucke

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Borucke
285 Newton St.
Oakland, CA 94606
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Liz Fowler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:21 PM
Please respond to lizzart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Liz Fowler
Ventura Street
Richmond, CA 94805
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bruce Mitchell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:20 PM
Please respond to ibamINV

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Mitchell
13659 Victory Blvd.
Van Nuys, CA 91401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jayde gelette to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:20 PM
Please respond to JaydeNicole

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jayde gelette
6936 Woodrow Wilson Drive
Los Angeles, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Cull to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:19 PM
Please respond to culldavid

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Cull
500 1/4 Belmont Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tony Chavez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:18 PM
Please respond to chavez _tony

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tony Chavez
11848 Vanowen St.
North Hollywood, CA 91605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Debra Jones to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:18 PM
Please respond to dsjones 654

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debra Jones
16676 E Greenhaven St
Covina, CA 91722
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tom Cyr to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to tacyr 1242

11/17/2014 05:17 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tom Cyr
350 Acero Place
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William Wallin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:16 PM
Please respond to wmwallin 45

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Wallin
5337 Zara Ave
Richmond, CA 94805
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ken Greenwald to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:16 PM
Please respond to ken .filmman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ken Greenwald
1930 Stewart St. G2
Santa Monica, CA 90404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robert Pann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:14 PM
Please respond to bobpann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Pann
2512 Aiken Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90064
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jill Blaisdell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:14 PM
Please respond to jillblaisdell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jill Blaisdell
5152 Earl Dr.
La Canada, CA 91011
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carl Cartwright to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:13 PM
Please respond to carcart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carl Cartwright
13556 Trumball St
Whittier, CA 90605
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Doug and Lee Buckmaster to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:13 PM
Please respond to bkmstr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

We are writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

We are not only strongly opposed, but totally opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

7. We live less than 100 YARDS from the railroad in Santa Barbara. Thank you for disapproving this potentially disastrous project.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Doug and Lee Buckmaster
5630-C Calle Real
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wendy Czarnecki to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:12 PM
Please respond to mczar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Czarnecki
200 Knudtsen Ln
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
DENISE BRASHEAR to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:08 PM
Please respond to 1DENISE0013

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

DENISE BRASHEAR
1719 S Oxnard Blvd.
OXNARD, CA 93030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rodney Robinson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to rodneyr 88

11/17/2014 05:08 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands and other highly volatile and extremely explosive oil to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town (Davis, CA) just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our riparian corridors, our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies. An explosive fire on our mountainous forrest lands could easily ignite a firestorm of great proportions.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rodney Robinson
PO Box 1753
DAVIS, CA 95617
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roberta Weissglass to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:07 PM
Please respond to rwactivist

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roberta Weissglass
P.O. Box 31015
Santa Barbara, CA 93130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marc Moritsch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:07 PM
Please respond to mmoritsch

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

My parents live in Nipomo.

Marc Moritsch
4220 Shadowcrest Drive
Santaq Maria, CA 93455
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Martin MacKerel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:06 PM
Please respond to martin .mackerel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Martin MacKerel
1647 McAllister St. #6
San Francisco, CA 94115
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Aggers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:04 PM
Please respond to katsaggers

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Aggers
14622 Haynes St
Van Nuys, CA 91411
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maryanne Lowman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:04 PM
Please respond to Dog 563

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maryanne Lowman
171 Jules ave
San Francisco, CA 94112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Les Schellhous to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:03 PM
Please respond to LesSchellhous

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Les Schellhous
P.O. Box 4175
Ventura, CA 93007
US